

DUKE
UNIVERSITY



DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

A faint, light gray watermark is visible in the background, depicting a classical architectural style with four columns supporting a triangular pediment.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

JOSEPH NICHOLS AND THE NICHOLITES:

11

A Look at the “New Quakers” of Maryland,

Delaware, North and South Carolina

by

Kenneth Lane Carroll

PUBLISHED BY

THE EASTON PUBLISHING COMPANY

EASTON, MARYLAND

**COPYRIGHT, 1962 BY
KENNETH L. CARROLL
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES**

JOSEPH NICHOLS AND THE NICHOLITES:
A Look at the "New Quakers" of Maryland,
Delaware, North and South Carolina

To the Memory of
M. ETHEL LANE CARROLL
and
SANDRA LEE WARRINGTON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
FOREWORD by Henry J. Cadbury	xi
 CHAPTER	
I. THE SPIRITUAL PILGRIMAGE OF JOSEPH NICHOLS	13
II. JOHN WOOLMAN AND THE NICHOLITES	18
III. JOSEPH NICHOLS AND HIS FOLLOWERS FROM 1766 TO 1770	25
IV. ORGANIZATION AND GROWTH OF THE NICHOLITE SOCIETY	33
V. THE NICHOLITES OF NORTH AND SOUTH CAROLINA	46
VI. THE NICHOLITES BECOME QUAKERS	54
 APPENDIX:	
PART I: NICHOLITE BIRTH RECORDS	72
PART II: NICHOLITE MARRIAGES	80
PART III: WITNESSES TO NICHOLITE MARRIAGES	84
PART IV: NICHOLITES ADMITTED INTO THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS	92
PART V: NICHOLITE WILLS	98
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
INDEX	105

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw the rise of a number of religious sects native to the United States. Few of them have had as unusual an origin and as interesting a history as did the Nicholites of Maryland, Delaware, North and South Carolina.

The religious pilgrimage by which these people traveled from being an unchurched group of fun-seeking persons to becoming a society of "sober and well-behaved men and women" closely followed that of their founder and leader, Joseph Nichols. Rather than splitting from an already existing religious body, as did many of the new sects, the Nicholites arose from a group of people with little or no religious connections. The end of the Nicholite Society likewise seems unique. The harmony, love, and cooperation which existed between the segments of the Nicholites when most of them sought membership in the Society of Friends is all too rarely found in other groups under similar circumstances.

My own interest in this movement sprang originally from three sources: connection with the Society of Friends, love of colonial history, and knowledge that two of my great-great-great-great-grandfathers, Zorobabel Marine (1736-1821) and Jonathan

Willson (d. 1795), were members of the Nicholites or "New Quakers." Upon first running across the unfamiliar name of the Nicholites in late 1949 my curiosity about them was aroused and has continued to grow. In the thirteen years following this date a great amount of time and research have gone into trying to develop a picture of these people and an understanding of their religion and its meaning for them. This brief book is the result of that interest in the Nicholites.

Some of this material, in the form of articles and essays, has appeared earlier in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, *Delaware History*, *North Carolina Historical Review*, *The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*, and in Anna C. Brinton (ed.), *Then and Now: Quaker Essays*. All of these earlier treatments of the Nicholite movement are found listed in the bibliography.

I should like to express my appreciation to Dr. Henry J. Cadbury for encouraging me to write this book, to Alyene Porter for reading the manuscript, and to Mrs. B. A. Petty for typing the various stages of the manuscript.

Kenneth Lane Carroll

Southern Methodist University

March, 1962

FOREWORD

This monograph is a small chapter in the religious history of America, but a chapter worth recording as an example of the recurrent emergence of genuine concern for the purity of first-hand faith and practice. Dr. Kenneth Carroll has for some years diligently pursued the search for historic data about the Nicholites in out-of-the-way places and has succeeded in piecing together an intelligible story. This volume digests eight earlier articles by the same author on the subject. Much remains unknown and is likely to remain so after such thorough gleaning of the field. In fact, the reader may well be surprised that so much can be learned about so obscure a sect. Their name is not listed in the usual books of reference nor their founder, Joseph Nichols, in the biographical dictionaries. Quakerism, to which the Nicholites seem only a footnote, was itself a minority group at the time and area of their parallel existence. Both had the habit of keeping records, in spite of the comparative illiteracy of the smaller unit. To these, to Quaker Journals, and to public archives the following essay is indebted.

What we do know of them bears witness to the unconfined seedbed of fresh social sensitivity. The attitude of the Nicholites to slavery, even if later helped by that of Woolman and other Friends, may well have been independent. Strange as seems to us today the almost universal acceptance of slavery among the churches of the Eighteenth Century, any group which relied more on the inward authority of conscience than on the customs of environment no matter how provincial in horizon might easily take first steps towards emancipation. John Woolman often came upon sensitive individuals and refers to "some of our Society and some of the Society called New Lights" as teaching Negroes to read. This reference is apparently to the Western

Shore of Maryland and Virginia and in 1757, nearly a decade before Woolman's Journal mentions the followers of Joseph Nichols. New Lights was a widespread nickname in the American colonies, sometimes used, as Joseph Oxley found in New Hampshire in 1771, for people outstripping even the Quakers in austerity of scruple. Perhaps there is confusion; the Nicholites themselves suggest their nickname meant followers of Nichols' Light. There may have been anachronism in Woolman's own recollection. This single passage illustrates how the Nicholites and Quakers represented *pari passu* an evolving conscience against slavery that was not limited by sectarian boundaries.

At first sight the influence of one group upon the other looks as though it were regularly Quaker influence on the Nicholites. That may be because to us the Quaker principles and practices are well-known and labelled. Plainly the Nicholite group was not a secession from Quakerism but independent. Their statement in 1778 to the General Assembly of North Carolina that while their principles were the same as those of the Quakers "for some reasons which we could render if required we hitherto have not thought it best to join membership with them." rouses our curiosity. We should like to know the reasons.

In many ways their resemblance to Quakerism at its best was precisely in the delicacy of feeling with which they first kept themselves separate from Quakerism, though on very good terms, and then deliberately without offending their own hesitant members joined the larger and older Society. It is to be wished that in these days of church mergers equal charity and consideration might always prevail.

To the general reader this story here presented is self-explanatory. To the historian it will be a satisfaction to have in brief and clear compass the information which Kenneth Carroll has been able to collect.

Henry J. Cadbury

Haverford, Pennsylvania

March, 1962

CHAPTER I

THE SPIRITUAL PILGRIMAGE OF JOSEPH NICHOLS

Toward the end of the colonial period of history there suddenly appeared in Maryland and Delaware a religious society known by the name of Nicholites or "New Quakers." Like the Rogerenes of New Jersey and Connecticut to the north and the Edisto community in South Carolina to the south, this independent religious group was very similar to the Society of Friends, or Quakers, in practice and principles. Of these three similar, yet different, societies, the Nicholites became the most widespread and the best known. At the end of the eighteenth century they could be found in Delaware, Maryland, North and South Carolina.

This very interesting sect which saw its rise in the rural area along the Delaware-Maryland border in the 1760's owed its existence to Joseph Nichols. A native of Delaware, he was born near Dover about 1730 and engaged in husbandry in Kent County, Delaware. Nichols received very little formal education but is said to have been "endowed with strong powers of mind and a remarkable flow of spirits."

Growing to manhood at a time when many colonists were unchurched and when the influence of the Church of England was already declining, but before the beginning of the rapid sweep of Methodism through Delaware and the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Joseph Nichols and his friends spent a great deal of their leisure in the pleasures of the day—dancing, fiddling, horse-racing, and attendance at fairs where they were noted for their "frolicking and merriment." Lambert Hopkins, a contemporary of Nichols, has said that this was an age that was characterized by a "laxity of manners, and insensibility of mind" among the inhabitants of the Delmarva Peninsula. Furthermore, he continued, "a general blindness with regard to their duty to God appeared mostly to prevail."¹

In the 1750's Joseph Nichols married Mary Tumlin, daughter of Nathaniel Tumlin of Kent County, Delaware, who in 1755 left his daughter a farm containing 115 acres. Joseph and Mary

Nichols retained this land until 1764 when they sold it to Ruben Oliver. Later Nichols bought 224 acres from Joseph and Elizabeth Chadwick and Winlock Wheeler in Mispillion Hundred on the south side of Ivy Branch in Kent County. Three children are known to have been born to Joseph and Mary: Rhoda on March 8, 1756; Isaac, January 22, 1758; and Rachel, September 5, 1763. One of the daughters died sometime before 1770, and Isaac, "a poor infirm child who was disordered with the dropsy," died in 1773.

Joseph Nichols' humor, vivacity, and ability to amuse others made his company very much sought after by the young people of his neighborhood, so that on First-days (as he and his followers later, under Quaker influence, came to call Sundays) he was frequently the center of a crowd. At these and other times of leisure Nichols often entertained his friends with anecdotes and songs. These pleasant gatherings of friends and neighbors continued in much the same way until there occurred an unfortunate accident which caused a profound change in Nichols—driving him to deeper thinking about the meaning of life. This episode he later described to Lambert Hopkins and others, saying that "he was at a frolic where they met together for merriment, such as dancing, etc. At this frolic he was accompanied by a very particular and intimate friend, who was taken ill and died suddenly at that place. As he reflected on the circumstance, it was made the means of producing a radical reformation in his life and conduct."²

History records many similar examples of radical changes which take place in the lives of certain people as a result of some such individual experience. Nichols, sensitive as he was to drama, must not have been unaware of the role that he was enacting: he was the friend who stands by and is transformed by a sudden death.

The mid-eighteenth century was a time of growing religiosity in America just as it was in England. At the same time that John Wesley led the great Methodist revival in England, George Whitefield and others were helping the Great Awakening, which had begun earlier with the preaching of Jonathan Edwards in

New England, to spread up and down the coast. There was a growing search for a more satisfying religion by many who found the conventional churches wanting. As a consequence there came a released religious enthusiasm which found formalism in the churches a symptom of spiritual decline and also gave a new sense of importance to many humbler citizens. This general religious development helps explain the religious pilgrimage that Joseph Nichols made and the way that his companions in mirth became his followers in religion.

Nichols, who does not appear to have been outwardly religious in the early years of his manhood, underwent a spiritual pilgrimage that moved him from his early "libertine" attitude to one of serious outlook and brought him to see "with clearness the line of duty which was marked out for him to pursue, and that his own peace of mind required that he should yield an unreserved obedience thereto, regardless of the opinions and customs of others."³

Unlike many individuals who undergo similar religious experiences, Joseph Nichols did not withdraw from his old circle of friends. He continued to be surrounded by his former companions who were still seeking his leadership in pleasure and mirth. Nichols, however, had become convinced that he and his followers should spend their time in a more satisfying way. After expressing this concern, he suggested that they read a portion of Scripture whenever they met. Out of the respect which they had possessed for him in the past, his neighbors agreed to this proposal. With the passage of time these gatherings were transformed from scenes of mirth to "seasons of serious thoughtfulness." Nichols' genius in friendship enabled him to move many of his friends and acquaintances along with him on this religious pilgrimage—so that as he became more "circumspect" in appearance, behavior, and conversation, so did they.

At length Joseph Nichols became convinced that he saw clearly before him his duty—to preach and, if necessary, to ignore the customs and opinions of other men. And, so, he appeared as a "minister" among his former companions, convinced that peace and happiness could come only from seeking

and doing the right. It appears that Nichols began his ministry shortly after 1760, for he had already been preaching sometime before Lambert Hopkins became one of his followers in 1764 or 1765. By 1766, when John Woolman made his famous tour on foot through Delaware and the Eastern Shore, Nichols seems to have become well-known in his community.

It was, then, in the early 1760's that Nichols began his brief ministry which lasted until 1770. In this short period of less than ten years he traveled through Delaware, both the Eastern and Western Shores of Maryland, and even in the area of Pennsylvania around Philadelphia. In his meetings Nichols sat in silence, as the Friends or Quakers around him did, until he felt himself called to preach. When he felt no such impulse, his meetings (which were held under the shade of trees, sometimes in private homes, and occasionally in the meeting houses of Friends) ended in silence. If asked beforehand whether or not he would preach that day, his answer was, "I mean to be obedient."⁴

It was Nichols' belief that man must be obedient to the "Inward Director." As his followers later wrote, he "believed in the light that Shines in the understanding of man and woman that Discovers to them betwixt good and evil, right and wrong and reproves for evil and Justifies for well-Doing, to be the only means of Grace to enable us to work out our Salvation, and as he believed so he preached."⁵ This aspect of his teaching was readily accepted by his religious followers; in fact, it was this very thing which earned them their title or name—"Nicholites." The Nicholites' own interpretation of the origin of this name, originally given to them in scorn, was this: "We amongst many other Soules became believers in the light and in a reproachful and revileing manner was called Nicholites as much as to say followers of Nichol's light."⁶

Lambert Hopkins, who accompanied Nichols on some of his preaching tours, reports that Nichols' preaching was "remarkably powerful and afflicting to the wicked, and was made effectual to the reformation of many." Our one brief description of Nichols comes from Hopkins who many years after the death

of Nichols wrote, "My acquaintance with Joseph Nichols commenced somewhere about the year 1764 or 1765, when I was about twenty-three years of age, and continued during the space of seven or eight years: in which time considerable intimacy subsisted between us, I being, as it were, his son in the faith. He appeared to me to be between thirty and forty years of age. In stature, he was about middle size, dressed very plain, principally in undyed clothes."⁷ In this opening period of his ministry Joseph Nichols preached a doctrine of self-denial. It was his belief that all things which tended to exalt the "creature" must be regulated and subdued. This attitude can be seen also in the plain clothes which Hopkins remembered from his first contact with Joseph Nichols.

Notes

1 — Isaac and John Comly (eds.), *Friends' Miscellany: Being a Collection of Essays and Fragments, Biographical, Religious, Epistolary, Narrative, and Historical; Etc.* (Philadelphia, 1833), IV, 256-257.

2 — *Ibid.*, IV, 257. See also Samuel M. Janney, *History of the Religious Society of Friends, from its Rise to the year 1828* (Philadelphia, 1867), III, 493.

3 — *Friends' Miscellany*, IV, 242.

4 — *Ibid.*, IV, 257.

5 — Nicholite Petition, to the General Assembly of North Carolina (Legislative Papers, House of Commons, 1778), p. 1. This original document is preserved in the State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, N. C.

6 — *Ibid.*, p. 1.

7 — *Friends' Miscellany*, IV, 256.

CHAPTER II

JOHN WOOLMAN AND THE NICHOLITES

The greatest external influence upon Nichols and his followers during the formative period of their movement came from John Woolman of New Jersey. John Woolman (1720-1772) has been called "the most Christ-like individual that Quakerism has ever produced."¹ His life and thought touched thousands of people in his own age and through his *Journal* and essays still continue to do so to this very day.

Woolman over the years came to feel that slavery was a great evil. This view arose from personal experiences and observations in his own New Jersey area and from several religious journeys he made into the South in 1746 and 1757. A work entitled *Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes* presented his views in 1754; a second part appeared in 1762. Although this was not the earliest Quaker treatise published on the subject, it was certainly one of the most effective that have ever appeared.

In 1766 John Woolman made the first of his famous "foot-journeys" into the Upper South—walking through Delaware and the Eastern Shore of Maryland. This "foot-journey" was a part of Woolman's attack upon the institution of slavery. He saw slavery as a cancerous disease, eating away at the moral and spiritual life of the Society of Friends and of America. Slavery was an evil that must be destroyed. As he made his way slowly through Delaware and the Eastern Shore, Woolman became an "embodied conscience," seeking to awaken people to the great evil of slavery which sprang from luxury and selfish profit (which alone made luxury possible).

Woolman had long felt that actions speak louder than words — that behavior is more convincing than speech. As he called upon others to cut themselves loose from the institution of slavery and to give up their love of luxury and ease, his own example underlined his message. Woolman had also begun to wear undyed clothes sometime before this 1766 journey southward—perhaps as early as the end of 1762. This strange costume became

his "cross"; he wore it as a protest against both slavery and war, testifying against the slave labor used in producing the dye and the love of luxury that led people to seek it.

This journey in the early summer of 1766 through the Delmarva Peninsula took Woolman to a number of Quaker meetings in Delaware and on the Eastern Shore. After visiting Friends of Motherkill Meeting in Delaware, he moved on to Maryland and spent time among Quakers of Tuckahoe Meeting (near Matthewstown in Talbot County) and Marshy Creek Meeting (near Preston, in Caroline County). Concerning these three places he writes: "At these our three last meetings were a considerable number of people, followers of one Joseph Nichols, a Preacher, who I understand is not in outward Fellowship with any Religious Society of People, but who professeth nearly the same principles as our Society doth, and often travels up and down, appointing meetings to which many people come."² Woolman was struck at this time by the similarity between Nicholite and Quaker beliefs and practices—a likeness quite clear to the Nicholites also, for a little later on some of them wrote, "We Do profess and Confess the same principals that the Quakers doth, but for Some reasons which we Could render if required we hitherto have not thought it best to Joyn Membership with them."³

Woolman, after commenting on the similarity of the Nicholites to Friends, does not speak of any apparent differences between the two societies or of anything unusual about them which strikes his attention. The remainder of his brief description of them runs as follows: "I hear some Friends speaking of their neighbours who had been Irreligious people that were now his followers, and were beeome Sober well-behaved men and Women. Some irregularities I hear have been amongst the people at Several of his Meetings, but from the whole of what I have [heard] I believe the man and some of his followers are honestly disposed, but [believe] Skilful Fathers are wanting amongst them."⁴

Woolman does not define the "irregularities" which he mentions in this passage. Probably the word refers to the emotion

which pervaded the audience at some of Nichols' gatherings and which sometimes expressed itself in unusual ways. We are told elsewhere that "some would cry out audibly, and even prostrate themselves in the meeting."⁵ Once again it should be remembered that the mid-eighteenth century was a time of growing religiosity in America. Frequently this heightened religious feeling expressed itself in various physical manifestations.

The *Journal of John Woolman* does not record a meeting of Woolman and Nichols but speaks only of the presence of some of Nichols' followers at these meetings in the summer of 1766. At the same time, Woolman's account does not rule out the possibility of such a meeting. Moreover, it must be pointed out that on several different occasions followers of Joseph Nichols were present at Woolman's meetings. Even if Nichols did not, for some reason, meet this man whose outlook and message was so like his own, accounts of what he said and did would soon reach Joseph Nichols. Also it seems quite probable that Nichols, living not far from Philadelphia and surrounded by Quakers, may have been acquainted with some of Woolman's ideas before Woolman ever made this trip. Woolman's two-part essay on Slavery, published in 1754 and 1762, had carried the approval of the Overseers of the Press in Philadelphia and was widely read by both Quakers and non-Quakers. It is only reasonable, therefore, to expect Joseph Nichols and his followers to have been influenced by Woolman during this formative period of his movement's growth and development.

The most obvious point of influence appears to have been on the subject of slaveholding—the main reason for Woolman's journey through the area. The extent of Woolman's influence on Nichols here is open to some question, for there exists the strong probability that Joseph Nichols had already developed his anti-slavery position shortly before the arrival of Woolman in June of 1766. Two bits of information support this point of view. The first is a claim made by Lambert Hopkins, who in 1817 recorded that he then remembered about Joseph Nichols whom he first met in 1764 or 1765 and followed until 1770. Hopkins says that Nichols "was the first man in these parts who

preached against the evil of slave-holding; so far did his conscientious scruples extend that he avoided putting up at places where the labour was done by slaves. His testimony in this respect met with some opposition, and even members of the Society of Friends opposed him; but it happened a short time afterwards, two Friends [Woolman and Sleeper] came down on foot and publically preached against the evil of slavery. Friends then received that testimony which they had refused from Joseph, and in a few years it became general among them to free their negroes.”⁶

In an earlier essay entitled “The Influence of John Woolman on Joseph Nichols and the Nicholites,” I questioned the accuracy of Hopkins’ memory.⁷ At that time I felt that this claim probably resulted from a later rivalry on the subject between Nicholites and Friends. I therefore suggested that it probably had its origin in the fact that the early Nicholites, almost as a group, manumitted their slaves early in 1768—several months before the Quakers of Marshy Creek Meeting did, but some months after Quakers in neighboring Talbot County did so. In another article published in 1961, entitled “Religious Influences on the Manumission of Slaves in Caroline, Dorchester and Talbot Counties,” I once again expressed my feeling of doubt concerning the authenticity of Hopkins’ claim.⁸

My views expressed in 1960 and 1961 were based upon an analysis of the manumission records of Dorchester County (which in 1768 still contained the area inhabited by most of the Nicholites). Since that time I have examined the records of Kent County, Delaware, and have discovered that James Anderson, one of Nichols’ earliest and staunchest followers, and his wife Ann Anderson freed a slave named Jane in the fourth month of 1766 —two months before John Woolman arrived in the area. Jane is described as a “Girl Born of the body of a Negroe Woman but supposed to be begotten by a White man which said Girl according to the Custom of the Land is held in Slavery and bondage.”⁹ Another manumission deed for the same county, dated May 24, 1766, shows Paris and Margaret Chipman freeing a Negro boy named Thomas.¹⁰

These two deeds of manumission are the only ones in which Nicholites freed slaves *before* Woolman's visit in the area. Although James and Ann Anderson and Paris and Margaret Chipman may possibly have arrived at their anti-slavery view independently, as some Delmarva Quakers also had, it seems wiser to accept these two cases as support for Hopkins' claim on the prior preaching of Nichols against slavery.

If Nichols, as seems likely, did proclaim anti-slavery views prior to June, 1766, and if he did persuade the Andersons and the Chipmans to free their slaves, then it is also true, as Hopkins claims, that Nichols met opposition both from his followers and others on this matter. Examination of the deeds of manumission for this area shows that all other Nicholites freeing slaves did so *after* Woolman, accompanied by John Sleeper, made his "foot-journey" through the area. Woolman appears to have made it possible for Nichols to move the rest of his followers to free their slaves.

Still another influence that Woolman may have had on Nichols and his followers centered around the type of clothes they wore. John Woolman, like his lesser-known contemporary Joshua Evans, had begun to wear undyed clothes sometime before his 1766 journey. With the exception of Lambert Hopkins' testimony of fifty years later (with all the possibilities of telescoping facts and remembrances), there is no evidence that Nichols wore undyed clothes before Woolman's arrival. There exists absolutely no evidence that the followers of Nichols dressed in undyed clothes prior to 1766. Woolman, with all the thoughts he had had on this subject since 1762, would have mentioned the fact. A few years after Woolman's journey the Nicholites became well-known for their undyed clothing. Quaker journalists of a later date, such as Isaac Martin, Job Scott, and Elias Hicks all show an interest in this aspect of Nicholite life—as did also the less sympathetic Methodist leaders Francis Asbury and Freeborn Garrettson.

What little information we do possess about the early preaching of Nichols suggests that Nichols had already started himself and his followers on a movement from luxury and display to

austerity in appearance. Early in his ministry Nichols had moved some of his female followers to the point where they gave up all ornaments, refusing to wear flowered or striped apparel. Their husbands are reported to have been opposed to this development; and they therefore attended Nichols' meetings in order to ridicule this practice. The husbands, too, were soon won over. It was about this time that Woolman, dressed in undyed clothes, arrived in their midst. His great sincerity and his deeply spiritual nature won their admiration. One can easily understand how the Nicholites, already embarked on an ascetic pilgrimage insofar as clothing is concerned, would be brought to adopt Woolman's undyed clothing as the "official" garb of their whole group (without catching the spirit that led Woolman to dress in this fashion).

Yet a third influence that Woolman must have wielded in this formative period of Nicholite growth and development would have centered around his peace testimony. Woolman was as opposed to war as he was to slavery. He believed that war came from the same basic causes as slavery—luxury and desire for selfish profit. In essays, letters, and public preaching he advocated a rejection of war. Rather than engaging in war man must live in the spirit that takes away the occasion of all war, seeking his true position in the one great family united in love and service of God. The Nicholites, a decade following Woolman's visit, possessed a very strong peace testimony.

Notes

1 — Thomas E. Drake, **Quakers and Slavery in America** (New Haven, 1950), p. 51.

2 — Amelia Mott Gummere (ed.), **The Journal and Essays of John Woolman** (Philadelphia, 1922), pp. 271-272.

3 — Nicholite Petition, p. 1.

4 — Gummere, **op. cit.**, p. 272.

5 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 243.

6 — **Ibid.**, IV, 258.

7 — Kenneth L. Carroll, "The Influence of John Woolman on Joseph

Nichols and the Nicholites," in Anna Brinton (ed.), **Then and Now: Quaker Essays, Historical and Contemporary** (Philadelphia, 1960), pp. 168-179. See especially p. 173.

8 — **Maryland Historical Magazine**, LVI (1961), 176-197. See especially p. 185.

9 — See Kent County Deeds, Liber R, Folio 85. These records are found in the Kent County Courthouse, Dover, Delaware. This deed is witnessed by David and Sarah Hilford.

10 — *Ibid.*, Liber R, Folio 207. This deed is witnessed by Thomas Dunning and William Manlove.

CHAPTER III

JOSEPH NICHOLS AND HIS FOLLOWERS FROM 1766 TO 1770

Nichols' anti-slavery message received an added impetus from the visit of Woolman and Sleeper in the summer of 1766. Four of his followers, James and Ann Anderson and Paris and Margaret Chipman, all living in Kent County, Delaware, had freed their slaves in April and May of 1766, but no more of the Nicholites appear to have followed their example. Following Woolman's journey Nichols resumed this aspect of his message with increased zeal. He is reported to have said that "it was made known to him of the Lord, that in the process of time the slaves would be a freed people."¹

As Nichols continued to direct the attention of his movement to this problem, several more of his followers in Delaware were moved to manumit their slaves. On August 29, 1766, Zachariah Goforth and his wife Sarah freed their Negro slave Casar. Their deed of manumission, spelling out their reasons for this action, shows what Nichols (and Woolman) had taught: "Being Convinced by the Inshining Light of God's Eternal Spirit that the above said Custom and Practice of Enslaving or Holding of Negroes in Slavery and Bondage During Life is an unchristian Custom and Practice Contrary to a Gospel Dispensation and Opposite to the Spirit of the New Covenant which Teaches us and all that are Led thereby to take off every yoke and Let the Oppressed go free and to do unto all men as we would they Should do unto us."² A year later, on August 12, 1767, William Anderson freed five slaves: John, age 26; Lydia, 25; and her three children.³

Nichols came to feel so strongly on this subject that he refused to stay in the houses of slaveowners. This, coupled with his re-enforced anti-slavery message, so convinced two of his followers in Maryland, William Dawson and William Harris, of the evil of slavery that they decided to set their slaves free. The public authorities in Dorchester County (for Caroline County still had not been organized) discouraged them, saying that

existing laws contained no provisions for such an act. The two Nicholites were advised, therefore, to try the slaves with "freedom" only for a time and then, after Dawson and Harris saw their folly, they might take their slaves back into service. The two Nicholites remained firm in their intention, setting their seven slaves free in March, 1768, and each of them stating that freedom had been granted to his slaves "to satisfy my conscience." Daniel Adams and Richard Tull soon followed their example, also expressing the desire "to satisfy my conscience."⁴

The teaching of their leader and the example of these Nicholites in Delaware and Maryland made such an impression upon the other Nicholites that their position became the one accepted by the entire group. The Nicholites were consistent in their anti-slavery attitude and refused to hire slaves from slave-owners. Some Nicholites carried their zeal even further. James Horney refused to eat with slave-holders or to use any goods either produced or procured through slave labor. Horney, like Nichols (and Woolman), knew that when one is content to benefit from the fruits of slavery he enters, to some degree, into the position of being a slaveholder himself.

When at a later date the Nicholites drew up a discipline, or set of rules, they incorporated in it the following, "Any Person Holding a Slave is not to be Admitted to be a member." Their list of queries, also adopted at a later time, likewise dealt with this subject: "Are Friends careful to bear a faithful testimony against Slavery in its various branches, and provide in a suitable manner for those in their families that have had their freedom secured to them; are they instructed in useful learning, and is the welfare of such as have been set free attended to and the necessities of them relieved?"

There are few stories about Nichols which remain. Of the handful that do, one deals with Nichols' giving his own coat to a poor slave who attended his meeting without one. Negroes, whether slave or free, appear to have been accepted fully and freely at the meetings of Joseph Nichols. Isaac Linnegar, "a part-colored man" and Rosannah, a slave freed by Daniel Adams in 1768, were married under Nicholite care in 1769, and their

children's births were recorded in the Nicholite birth records. This same Isaac Linnegar was farming the land owned by Nichols in Mispillion Hundred, Kent County, Delaware, when Nichols died at the end of 1770.

When it came to the subject of paid ministers, Joseph Nichols' outlook again seems to have been influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the Quakers around him. An important part of his message, therefore, was devoted to preaching against a "hireling ministry." This meant several things for Nichols and his followers. First of all, forbidden by their principles to acknowledge a man-made ministry, the Nicholites felt that they could not "consistently consummate their marriages before a priest although required so to do."⁵ Finally the Nicholites developed a wedding ceremony which closely resembled that of Friends, which was eventually recognized as legal by the State of Maryland. The engaged couple, after having received permission from the Society, publically exchanged vows without a clergyman being present. All witnesses present at the ceremony were then asked to sign the marriage certificate.

The earliest copy of a Nicholite marriage certificate which we possess is that of Isaac Charles and Nancy Payne who were wed in 1766. As the earliest recorded Nicholite certificate, it possesses a twofold interest—first, it is typical of those which follow and, second, it shows the likenesses to its Quaker counterpart. This certificate is as follows: "These are to Certify all persons whom it may concern that Isaac Charles and Nancy Payne Both Single of Dorchester County in Maryland having first publickly made known their Intention of marriage and No Lawfull objection being made they the said Isaac Charles and Nancy Payne Did on the Twenty-first day of the Ninth month one Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Six in the presence of a publick congregation of people at the House of Solomon Charles in Dorchester County aforesaid publickally acknowledge their marriage Engagement Each to the other the man taking the woman to be his Lawfull weded wife the woman taking the man to Be her Lawfull weded Husband In Consequence of which the woman hereafter assumes the Sir Name of the Man in Testi-

mony whereof we the Subscribers Being present have hereunto Subscribed our names." Witnesses to this marriage were Thomas Addams, Sophia Branghon, John Edmondson, Jr., Mary Edmondson, John Flower, Moses Leverton, Joseph Nichols, David Payne, Martin Pegg, Joseph Standley, Richard Stanford, David Sullivane, Florence Sullavin, Esther Tull, John Wright, Levin Wright, William Wright.

In addition to the problem of the marriage ceremony, Nicholite opposition to the "hireling ministry" expressed itself (as it also did among the Quakers around them) by objecting to the tax levied upon all citizens of Maryland for benefit of the clergy and institutions of the Church of England which remained the Established Church in Maryland until the outbreak of the American Revolution. William Dawson, apparently something of a zealot, expressed himself vigorously against a "hireling ministry." As a result of his outspoken opposition to the "priests' tax" he was arrested and suffered imprisonment in the Cambridge jail which was about thirty miles from the place where he lived. It should be remembered that the section of Caroline County where he lived was still a part of Dorchester, so that the Cambridge jail served the whole area.

Dawson's arrest soon became widely known, and the reason for his imprisonment was quickly noised around—so that great crowds gathered on the lawn outside the jail. Dawson had some of the apostolic zeal that marked Christians in the New Testament period. Always eager to make known his convictions, he took advantage of this opportunity to explain his principles and to exhort his listeners to follow his example. Finally the authorities felt it better to release him than have him preaching to multitudes through the windows of the jail.

Frequently, when attacking the "hireling priests" of his day, Joseph Nichols spoke of the time which was approaching when their "churches should be deserted, so as to become a shelter for the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air." In the years following these predictions this actually happened in many cases. One after another, following the disestablishment of the Church of England, many Anglican (or Episcopalian, as they later came

to be known) churches throughout this whole Eastern Shore area became so deserted that the doors were left open, with the result that cattle and sheep often sought refuge in them to escape the extremes of summer and winter.

William Needles, who noted the above development early in the nineteenth century, said that this "evinced the truth of the prediction of Nichols." He has described the whole development in the following paragraph: "Since the American Revolution, Episcopacy having lost ground and the Clergy being no longer able to force a maintenance many of the Churches (so called) on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, fell into neglect, were forsaken, and ultimately pulled down. One, in particular, situated in Caroline County, near Anthony Wheatley's, after being entirely deserted for about sixteen years, during which time the swallows literally built their nests in it; and undergoing partial decay, the flagstones with which the aisle was paved, were removed, and used by people for making grindstones, etc. During the Revolution, the lead which capped the brick work, or pillars that projected outside the building, was also removed, and finally, by general agreement of the neighbors, about the year 1814, the building was entirely pulled down, and the materials carried off, each taking what proportion he chose of them."⁶

Joseph Nichols, in the matter of profanity and oaths, took a position strikingly similar to that of the Quakers. He and his followers sought the right of affirmation rather than swearing. He also taught his followers that, just as in the ease of the first century Christians and of their own Quaker neighbors, they should avoid going to court to settle their difficulties. The Nicholites preferred not to appear in court at all (partly due to their difficulty with oaths), but when they were called upon by the courts or by public officials to interpret their principles and to explain their refusal to participate activity in secular affairs, they were always ready to give information and explain their beliefs.

It is in connection with Nichols' attitude toward the courts that we see another one of his teachings which was far advanced for his time—an attitude related in part to his disavowal of war.

This was his budding opposition to capital punishment. Although Nichols and the Nicholites never developed this thought to its logical conclusion, they did believe that they themselves should not be a party to bringing about a death sentence upon a man. As the Nicholites themselves later described their principles to the North Carolina Assembly, they wrote, "Another thing we believe we could not be clear in, that is to answer the law as a witness against any person that thereby they shalt be put to Death."

The Nicholites, under the leadership of Joseph Nichols, appear to have been caught up in the spirit of withdrawal from the world around them. In this attitude they were paralleling a development taking place in the Society of Friends. Down until the time of the French and Indian War Friends were both active and influential in the political life of Maryland and Delaware (then known as the "Lower Counties of Pennsylvania on the Delaware"). As a result of the growing emphasis upon war preparations, as well as the oaths connected with office holding, Maryland Quakers seem to have followed the example of their brethren in Pennsylvania and to have withdrawn from public life by the middle of the eighteenth century. The Nicholites, being one with the Quakers in this attitude, declined to accept any public offices. In one respect they were even more extreme than the Friends, for the Nicholites usually refused to participate in the elections which were held in their own localities.

Joseph Nichols, impressed to some degree by the example of John Woolman, appears to have moved his entire following in this period along with him in his testimony against extravagances in dress, furniture, and address. The Nicholites, following the example and preaching of Nichols, became exceedingly plain in their dress. All along the Delaware-Maryland border were to be seen women wearing bonnets and the men hats of undyed or natural white wool. They believed that dyeing cloth stemmed from ostentation more than from true usefulness and so these "New Quakers" rejected it as a superfluous expense. In addition to this testimony against dyeing cloth, the Nicholites were also strong in their opposition to mixing colors which were natural,

such as black and white wool or black wool and cotton. They even refrained from wearing black leather or blackening their shoes.

This austerity which made itself felt so strongly in their dress extended itself to other aspects of Nicholite life. No flowers were to be found in their gardens or around their dwellings as ornamentation. Nicholite furniture was of the simplest design—with stools and benches found in the place of chairs in the houses of Joseph Nichols and his followers. For ordinary travel the Nicholites usually moved around by foot [Could they be remembering the two Quakers traveling on foot?]; but when the distance was great, Nichols and his followers would go either by horseback or light carts, for there were no elaborate coaches to be found within this religious society.

This outlook of self-denial colored their lives so thoroughly that Nichols and Nicholites, in contrast to their earlier life, came to avoid places of diversion and amusement. Like many groups in the past and even a few in the present, Joseph Nichols and the small band of people who accepted his leadership came to the belief that there was a snare in too much schooling. Because they felt that education tended “to a dependence on literary acquirements in religious concern, instead of the qualifying influence of the Spirit,” Nicholites seldom had their children taught at school beyond learning to read.⁸ A number of them, it would seem, never were taught to write, for one discovers a surprising number of X’s instead of written signatures among the names of witnesses to the marriages. In this respect the Nicholites differed radically from the neighboring Friends or Quakers after whom they seem to have patterned themselves in so many other ways. From their earliest days in Maryland and Delaware Quakers had emphasized the education of their youth, often operating a number of schools for this purpose.

Joseph Nichols, in the few brief years that he was among these people as their spiritual leader, shaped their lives along the lines which we have pictured above. His work was cut short by his death which took place in December, 1770, when Nichols was still a relatively young man. He toiled at his religious work until

the very end of his life and at death was satisfied, apparently, with his achievements. Concerning Nichols' last moments, Lambert Hopkins records that "I have heard, that being asked on his death-bed in relation to the state of his mind, he said that he had delivered the messages of the Lord, had said all he had to say, and had nothing more to say. It is also stated that he closed his own eyes, and thus terminated his days in peace."⁹

When Nichols died at the end of 1770, he was survived by his wife Mary. His will, probated on December 31, 1770, also mentions two unnamed children.¹⁰ According to the administration papers filed in August, 1774, his son (Isaac, born 1758) died in 1773; but one daughter, name unknown, still survived. By this time his widow Mary had already been remarried to Levin Charles who had been one of Joseph Nichols' flock.¹¹ These papers also carry the note that his funeral had been provided at the cost of £ 2.

Notes

1 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 258.

2 — Kent County, Delaware, Deeds, Liber R, Folio 206. This manumission deed is witnessed by David Hildred and Benjamin Chipman.

3 — *Ibid.*, Liber R, Folio 207. This deed of manumission is witnessed by David Hildred, Samuel Robinson, and Thomas Dunning.

4 — Dorchester County Land Records, Liber Old 22, Folios 254-255, 308, 336, 356.

5 — Ezra Michener, *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism: Being Extracts from the Records of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and the Meetings Composing It, to Which is Prefixed an Account of Their First Establishment* (Philadelphia, 1860), p. 415. This was exactly the same problem that the early Quakers faced in both England and the American colonies.

6 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 259-260. An examination of local histories of various Eastern Shore counties shows this abandonment of Anglican churches was a frequent occurrence after the American Revolution.

7 — Nicholite Petition, p. 2.

8 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 248-249.

9 — *Ibid.*, IV, 258.

10 — Kent County, Delaware, Wills, Liber L, Folio 87. This will was witnessed by Covil Tumblin, James Anderson, and David Hildred. These records are found in the Kent County Courthouse, Dover.

11 — Administration Accounts filed in the estate of Joseph Nichols, Archives Vol. A 37, p. 226. These are now located in the Hall of Records, Dover.

CHAPTER IV

ORGANIZATION AND GROWTH OF THE NICHOLITE SOCIETY

Joseph Nichols, the founder of the movement that came to bear his name, was a man of great gifts. The strength and the appeal which he possessed are easily seen in the way that Nichols carried his friends of the days of mirth and worldliness along with him as he made his own religious pilgrimage, seeking the *summum bonum* of life. His appearance as a minister had quickened the spiritual life of countless people, especially many who lived in what is now Caroline County and in upper Dorchester in Maryland and in Kent and Sussex Counties in Delaware.

Nichols' career was relatively short—eight or nine years at the most. And yet the work he accomplished was destined to continue long after the man himself had ceased to be. Many were the people who had flocked to hear him and who had been convinced by the fervency of his zeal. While Nichols was still with them, these men and women had embraced his views and had conformed their lives to the principles which he had set forth in both deeds and words. Truly Nichols had sown his seed well, so that it grew and flourished.

The band that Nichols had gathered together included all kinds of people: former slaves and ex-slaveowners, tenant farmers and landowners of moderate means, educated and uneducated persons, a few with potential ability to lead and many just learning how to follow. The death of Joseph Nichols must have come as a real shock to the flock which he had gathered and which had come to look upon him as its shepherd. What were they to do? Who were there among them who would give the Nicholite movement the inspiration and leadership that it needed? These and other questions must have plagued the minds of the more thoughtful members of the Society in the months following his death, for Nichols died without bringing about any organization of his followers.

As the Nicholites continued to think about the life, the

preaching, and the death of Joseph Nichols, they became convinced that they should continue their existence as a people called out of the world around them—remaining true to all that their founder had imparted to them. Nichols, their guide and their example, was gone! And, so, it became increasingly clear to the Nicholites that they must organize themselves, setting up some sort of church government by which the life of the movement could be regulated. Their decision to organize came at the end of 1774, almost four years after Nichols' death.

The Nicholites' decision was as follows: "Agreed by a meeting of friends assembled together on the fifth day of the twelfth month Anno Domini 1774 To Consider of Some Things Relating to the General Benefit of the Church of Christ the aforesaid assembly did then agree to Hold their Monthly meeting at the House of James Harriss the first and Second day of the first week in Every Month (viz) the First Day for the worship of God. The Second Day to Consider of Such Business as may Concern us, as Touching our Religious Society. The aforesaid assembly did then Conclude by the Consent and approbation of many more brethren that friends Should Carefully Collect their Marriage Certificates and bring them to the Said Meeting in order to have them entered upon Record." This decision to organize was signed in behalf of the larger Nicholite Society by Richard and Ann Accles [Eccles], James and Ann Anderson, William Batchlor, William Berry, Robert Bishop, Joshua Chileutt, Noble Covey, William Dawson, James Harris, Mary Harris, William Harris, James Horney, John Richardson, Thomas Stanton, and William Warren.¹

These fourteen men and three women, most of whom were living in Caroline County, Maryland, probably furnished most of the leadership and guidance received by the Nicholites following Nichols' death. The impetus to organize must have stemmed from this group also. William Dawson, William Harris, and James Horney all figure prominently in what little information we do possess about this period. Above all others, however, would stand James Harris, at whose house the group decided to have its Monthly Meetings. James Harris was born about 1733 and

was raised in the Church of England. His religious nature became evident while he was still young, although he later felt that he "did not make much progress in the path of True religion until near the thirtieth year of his age; about which time, attending more closely to the witness in himself, he joined a pious people, distinguished by the name of Nicholites."²

James Harris, it would seem, was one of the several people who, prior to 1774, had "appeared in the ministry and exercised their gifts to the edification and comfort of the members."³ By 1780 Harris was clearly recognized as their leader according to the *Journal* of Francis Asbury, the Methodist leader who was active in the Delmarva area at this time. Harris' natural ability, spiritual insights, and relative economic freedom (at his death he owned six hundred acres in Maryland and an unspecified amount of land in Sussex County, Delaware) all qualified him for the position of leadership that he came to fill.

When the Nicholites or "New Quakers" organized as a religious society in 1774, they agreed to hold their business meetings once a month, just as the neighboring Quakers did. At first this required only two days, Sunday and Monday (or the "first and second day of the first week" in every month). As time passed, however, the period of the Monthly Meeting was expanded so that it began on Saturday, or seventh day, and lasted through Monday, or second day. First there came on the seventh day morning a meeting of the ministers and elders of the group. Later during that day a "public" meeting, open to all, was held. Then, in a "select" meeting (*i.e.*, open only to members), the Nicholites transacted the business of their religious society, with the men and women sitting together. In this respect the Nicholites differed from the nearby Quakers, who continued to hold separate business meetings for men and women down until the middle of the nineteenth century. On the other two days of the Monthly Meeting "public meetings" were held. It has been recorded that there were often a thousand people present at these services open to the general public.⁴

It was at these monthly meetings for business that the Nicholite marriages were solemnized. The couple planning marriage

would already have announced their intentions to wed at some earlier meeting and would have received the permission of the Monthly Meeting. Their wedding ceremony was quite similar to that of the Quakers upon which it must have been based—with no minister performing it but with the marriage taking place “in the presence of God and of Friends who are gathered together.”

What little information we do possess about the period following the organization of the movement in 1774 suggests that the Nicholites had a difficult existence for some time. For several years, until 1776, there was the question of “priests’ wages” to harass them.⁵ The authorities also insisted upon administering oaths to them—in spite of the fact that their religion forbade the Nicholites to take oaths. Some people, concerned with property rights and inheritances, questioned the legality of Nicholite marriages and the legitimacy of their children. And, to be sure, their scruples against war could only bring suffering upon them after the outbreak of the American Revolution.

The Nicholites, like the neighboring Quakers who influenced them in so many ways, had a firm and unwavering testimony against fighting. Joseph Nichols himself died before the opening of the Revolutionary War; but many of his followers were subjected to imprisonment from time to time when, heeding the inner light, they found it impossible to take up arms and engage in battle. Many of the Nicholites were also subjected to frequent restraint of goods because of their devotion to peace.

Some of the Nicholites limited their testimony against war to a refusal to fight, while others attempted to carry out their witness to its logical conclusion. William Dawson was so consistent in seeking to do what he believed to be right that he even refused to accept or use the paper currency which had been issued to carry on the Revolutionary War. Such behavior could only lead to suffering! The politicians of his day subjected him to great abuse, and his unusual conduct caused his neighbors and customers to criticize him severely. Yet, in spite of this, Dawson’s honesty, sincerity, and integrity caused his business of making carts and spinning wheels to expand. He appears to

have been much more fortunate than the Delaware Quaker John Cowgill of Duck Creek, who saw millers refuse to grind his corn, his children sent home from school, and newspaper advertisements proclaiming him an enemy to his country—all for refusing to use paper money. On one occasion some local bullies seized him while on his way to meeting for worship, fastened on him a sign saying “On the circulation of the Continental currency depends the fate of America,” hauled him to a neighboring town, and paraded him through it.⁶

Just when the Nicholites first petitioned the General Assembly of Maryland for relief from some of these difficulties under which they labored is uncertain. It was not until 1783, at the end of the Revolution, that we find the General Assembly willing to listen to their petition to be freed from taking oaths. In 1783 a law “for the relief of the Christian society of people called the Nicholites, or New Quakers” was enacted. It reads as follows:

“WHEREAS the society of people called Nicholites, or New Quakers, have, by their humble petition to this general assembly, set forth, that they labour under many great and grievous inconveniences, owing to their conscientious scruples relative to the taking oaths in the usual form, and not being admitted to declare the truth of their knowledge by solemn affirmation: And whereas it is declared in the thirty-sixth section of the declaration of rights, that the manner of administrating an oath to any person ought to be such as those of the religious persuasion, profession or denomination, of which such a person is one, generally esteem the most effectual confirmation by the attestation of the Divine Being:

Therefore,

“Be it enacted by the general assembly of Maryland, That the society of people called Nicholites, or New Quakers, shall be and they are hereby entitled to, and shall have and enjoy all the rights, privileges, immunities and franchises, that the people called Quakers are in any manner entitled to enjoy, under the declaration of rights, form of government, or any law or laws

in force within this state, any law, custom or usage, to the contrary notwithstanding.”⁷

For some years following the beginning of the society in 1774 the Nicholites continued holding their meetings at the home of their members, and they also frequently attended meetings for worship at the nearby Quaker meeting houses. John Woolman, as we have seen, reported them attending his meetings in 1766. We are told by traveling Quaker ministers that this continued to be the case down until the close of the eighteenth century when the Nicholites finally merged with the Society of Friends.

After some years of existence as an organized society the Nicholites felt a need to have meeting houses of their own. The exact time at which the Nicholites erected the three buildings that they came to possess cannot be established, for the minutes of the Society have disappeared. It is only through a careful examination of the marriage certificates that a rough estimate of the date can be made. One of these three meeting houses came into existence as early as 1778, for weddings between 1778 and 1784 are reported to have taken place at “Friends’ meeting-house in Caroline County,” whereas before 1778 they are simply listed as being at “a Friends’ house.” In 1784 mention is made of meeting houses at Centre (near Concord) and at Tuckahoe Neck (near Denton). Not until 1785 do we find mention of marriages taking place “at Friends’ meeting-house in Northwest Fork,” in the vicinity of Federalsburg. By 1785, then, all three of the Nicholite meeting houses were in use and were spoken of by name.

As with the Quakers in their earliest period, so it seems, the Nicholites at first found no necessity to establish a definite set of rules to govern the behavior of their members. There was a freedom in the years immediately following Joseph Nichols’ death. Gradually, however, there came a slow shift in emphasis from the pure leading of the spirit to some reliance on outward rules. More and more of the Nicholites felt the need of definite regulations by which the society might govern its members and they in turn might order their individual lives.

Just when they arrived at this decision is not known, but the only copy of their rules of discipline known to the writer dates from the "1st of the 1st month, 1793."

In the front of the volume which contains the marriage records of this group we find that "The following was Considered and Adopted for Rules Amongst us of the society of People called Nicholites or New Quakers":

1. That all Marriage Certificates be Recorded—Births and deaths also.
2. Any member joining in a Marriage with one that is Not a member of our society do thereby forfeit their Right Amongst Friends or Allowing Such Marriage in their House do also Forfeit their Right amongst Friends.
3. Any Member Attending Such a Marriage, shall be Called on to give a Reason for their Conduct in that Respect.
4. Any Member Intending to Marry Shall first Inform the Elders of the Meeting to Which they Belong—and if No Objection then the same to be minuted that a necessary Enquiry may be made of the Clearness of the Parties from others—and Consent of Parents or any other Necessary Enquiry may be made—and if Nothing to the Contrary Appear by the Next Monthly Meeting—the Parties to be left to their Liberty to Twice Publish their intention—and if no Objection Come forward they may Consume their marriage According to the good order practiced Amongst Friends.
5. Two or Three Friends of good Repute to be chosen as Overseers of each Monthly Meeting—and to Render an Account of their service and Duties to the Said Meeting Whensoever called thereto.
6. Those who Neglect to Attend Meeting for Worship and Discipline at the Hour Appointed—or fall Asleep—or Frequently go in and out or Otherwise disturb the Meeting—Let them be Cautioned privately and then if Need be Reprove them publickly, and if they Cannot be reclaimed by Christian Endeavours of their friends to be disowned.
7. Any Friend Moving from the limits of one Meeting to

Another they Shall Procure a Certificate from the Meeting to Which they Belong that they may be Received as they are.

8. When any friend of the Ministry purposes to Travel in That service they should First Acquaint the Monthly Meeting Where they Belong—in order for their Brotherly Advice from the Meeting.

9. The Members of the Meeting only Have a right to set in Meeting of Business—Except on Application and Admittance by the Said Meeting.

10. Any friend having anything to offer in Meeting of Business should stand up—the better to Preserve that good order of Speaking one at a time.

11. Any Person Holding a Slave is not to be admitted to be a member.

12. No Member go to Law with a Member—Except some urgent Necessity—Nor with others until first Endeavoring by Easy terms—Offering to have the same settled by others.

Another thing which might be noted about the Nicholites in this quarter of a century between their organization and their merger with the Society of Friends is that, in addition to the rules of discipline which they possessed, they also developed a set of queries. Following the custom of Friends, it was the Nicholite practice to read these queries and then answer them in their Monthly Meetings—doing this about once every three months. The subjects which were dealt with in these queries concerning the spiritual welfare of the society resembled those of the Quakers. At some points, however, the Nicholites tended to examine things in much greater detail and with more precision than did the Friends—particularly when they were dealing with the subjects of dress and amusements. This was to be expected, however, with the excessive Nicholite insistence upon plainness.

The date at which these queries were produced is unknown. Joshua Evans, who visited the North Carolina Nicholites in 1797, recorded that “I observed that they had nine queries, which in substance were much like ours: these they read at times in their meetings.”⁸ Two copies, almost completely identical, of the

Nicholite queries have been located. The earlier one is a manuscript copy sent by Anthony Whitely [Wheatley], a former Nicholite, to Benjamin Ferris in 1847, and it is now located in the Ferris Collection at Swarthmore College. A second set, perhaps based upon Whitely's letter, appeared in the *Friends Intelligencer* for 1860. Both of these copies differ in three ways from the collection which Evans found in use among the North Carolina Nicholites in 1797. First, these two sets contain ten instead of nine queries; second, the query on slavery is next to the last instead of the final one; and third, their query on slavery is different from the one Evans knew. The fuller collection is as follows:

QUERIES OF THE NICHOLITE FRIENDS

- 1st. Are all Friends meetings, for worship and discipline duly and timely attended, and are Friends preserved from sleeping or needless going in and out of meeting, or any other uncomely behavior therein?
- 2d. Are Friends careful to avoid the occasion of any discord among them; and if any arise, is speedy endeavors used to end them; is talebearing backbiting and evil reports discouraged, and care taken not to speak that in absence of any that may tend only to expose them?
- 3d. Are Friends careful to bring up those who are under their immediate direction, to the due attendance of our meetings, to plainness of speech, behaviour and apparel, and in frequently reading the scriptures and other useful books, and restrain them from reading pernicious books and from frequenting the company of those that are of a disorderly behaviour, and from the corrupt conversation of the world?
- 4th. Are Friends careful to be at a word in all their traffic, and give good weight and measure, and avoid that evil practice of multiplying words to set their stuff to sale?
- 5th. Are Friends careful to settle their accounts annually, or as often as need may require, so as to give their creditors no cause to blame them; and careful in their engagements

- and faithful to perform them; are the necessities of the poor duly inspected and they assisted agreeably to their circumstances?
- 6th. Are Friends careful in the use of spirituous liquors to only make the needful use of them, and when their business takes them out amongst other people, are they careful to avoid light and needless discourse and not to be drawn away with the evil of the wicked?
 - 7th. Are Friends striving against the uncomely practice of laughter, when speaking about religious matters?
 - 8th. Are Friends careful to keep from making or buying any dyed, striped, flowered, corded or mixed stuff, and from all needless cuts and fashions, and bear a faithful testimony against the pernicious sin of pride?
 - 9th. Are Friends careful to bear a faithful testimony against Slavery in its various branches, and provide in a suitable manner for those in their families that have had their freedom secured to them; are they instructed in useful learning, and is the welfare of such as have been set free attended to and the necessities of them relieved?
 - 10th. Is care taken to deal regular with offenders in the spirit of meekness and wisdom, without partiality or unnecessary delay?

Readers of eighteenth century Quaker Journals frequently run across the Nicholites. Traveling Quaker ministers seem to have possessed a tender feeling for those people who were, in so many ways, very much like the Friends. Sometimes they spoke out against the excessive Nicholite dependence on "outward righteousness," but at the same time they usually expressed a real appreciation of this religious group.

It comes as a bit of surprise to encounter the descriptions of the Nicholites in the Journals of Freeborn Garretson and Francis Asbury. Here the attitude toward them is not so friendly. In places the language of the Methodist journalist takes on a hard and almost bitter tone. This, in all probability, stems from the fact that in the late 1770's both groups were young, aggressive, and missionary-minded (even to the extent of taking each

other's members). Asbury's first mention of the Nicholites, in 1778, is incidental, so that nothing of his attitude toward them is expressed: "I then rode to Mr. Freeny's; and the untaught audience felt the weight of Divine truth. Mr. F. has been under religious impressions amongst the Nicolites, but suffers spiritual loss by the want of more fortitude."⁹ The next reference, some sixteen months later, shows some of the tension that developed between these two societies. Asbury recorded, on January 23, 1780, that "In the afternoon I had a long conference with a Nicolite, who wanted to find out who were right—they or we; a man of no great argument, and I fear but little religion; this makes these people so troublesome to us."¹⁰

Almost a month later relations between Asbury and the Nicholites seem to have deteriorated even further. As a result, there appears the longest passage devoted to the Nicholites in his *Journal*: "The Nicolites had been working upon several of our friends, and had shook them with their craft. These are a people who sprung from one Nicols, a visionary, but I hope a good man: he held Quaker principles, but the Friends would not receive him. A certain James Harris is at present their leader; they clothe in white, take everything from nature, and condemn all other societies that do not conform to the outward: If a man were to speak like an archangel; if he sung, prayed, and wore a black, or coloured coat, he would not be received by these people. They were almost asleep when the Methodists came, but are now awake and working with simple, awakened people. They love, like some other denominations, to fish in troubled water. They oppose family prayer as much as any sinners in the country; and have much to say against our speakers: profess what they will, there is nothing in names."¹¹ The reason for the bitterness that lies behind and shines through this passage becomes apparent when one continues to read Asbury's *Journal*. One day later, on February 21, 1780, he records, "Some lazy, backsliding people among us are gone, after the Nicolites: let them go, for they were become as salt that had lost its savour; we want no such people."¹²

Freeborn Garrettson, who was quite active as a Methodist

preacher in the Delamarva area following his conversion experience in 1775, first mentions the Nicholites in 1779. At this time he was preaching in the neighborhood of Morgan Williams at Muskmelon, Delaware. Garrettson writes that, "Sunday, June 28, when I came to brother Williams's in Muskmelon, I found that a Nicelite preacher had been sowing his seed in the young society, and endeavouring to destroy the new-born children. He told them, 'It was a sin to wear any kind of clothing that was coloured; and that they ought never to pray but when they had an immediate impulse, and that it was wrong to sing.' Many people came together, but I perceived a considerable alteration; for some would not sing at all, and others sat both in time of singing and prayer. Some had taken off the borders of their caps, and condemned those who would not do as they had done: in short, some of my own spiritual children would scarcely hear me, because I wore a black coat."¹³

These quotations from Asbury and Garrettson show us how the Nicholites, after recovering from the initial shock that came with Nichols' death, continued to preach the message which they had received from Joseph Nichols. They likewise remind us that there were Nicelite centers in Delaware, even though these groups did not build any meeting houses as their Maryland brethren did. Being smaller in number to begin with and becoming somewhat depleted by the migration of some of their group to North Carolina, Delaware Nicholites probably found their houses large enough to accommodate their meetings. The small amount of material still extant suggests that the two main Delaware centers of Nicelite strength would have been in Kent County, around Mispillion Hundred, and in the Muskmelon section of Sussex County.

Notes

1 — Another copy of this same decision calls for the collecting of birth records. These two copies are found in the front of the two volumes containing Nicelite marriage certificates and Nicelite birth records. Both of these are now with the records of Third Haven Monthly Meeting of Friends on deposit at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.

2 — *Memorials Concerning Deceased Friends: Being a Selection from the Records of the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania, etc., from the Year*

1788 to 1878 Inclusive (Philadelphia, 1879), p. 85. This work is hereafter referred to as **Memorials**.

3 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 247.

4 — Michener, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

5 — The problem which Nicholites faced here was exactly that which harassed the Quakers and other non-conformists of that day. See Kenneth L. Carroll, "Maryland Quakers in the Seventeenth Century," **Maryland Historical Magazine**, XLVII (1952), 311-312, concerning Quaker difficulty over this matter.

6 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 244: "He was enabled to maintain the ground of this testimony with dignity and consistency; and thus kept his hands from being defiled with blood, as he considered it." See Elizabeth Waterston, **Churches in Delaware During the Revolution** (Wilmington, 1925), p. 45; and James Bowden, **The History of the Society of Friends in America** (London, 1854), II, 308.

7 — **Laws of Maryland Made Since M, DCC, LXIII, Consisting of Acts of Assembly Under Proprietary Government, Etc.**, (Annapolis, 1787), Laws of 1783, Chapter 18.

8 — Cited in Stephen B. Weeks, **Southern Quakers and Slavery: A Study in Institutional History** (Baltimore, 1896), p. 110.

9 — **The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury**, Edited by Elmer T. Clark, J. Manning Potts, and Jacob S. Payton (Nashville, 1958), I, 282.

10 — *Ibid.*, I, 331.

11 — *Ibid.*, I, 336.

12 — *Ibid.*, I, 336-337.

13 — Nathan Bangs, **The Life of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson: Compiled from His Printed and Manuscript Journals, and Other Authentic Documents** (New York, 1838), pp. 90-91.

CHAPTER V

THE NICHOLITES OF NORTH AND SOUTH CAROLINA

A number of Nicholites from the Delmarva area left their homes and moved southward to North Carolina about the very time that those who remained were organizing themselves into a religious society. The specific time of the migration can not be stated with certainty. A close examination of available materials suggests that this development took place at the close of 1774 or in the very opening months of 1775. The unsettled conditions following Nichols' death, problems arising from religious establishment in Maryland, the availability of new and cheap land, and other factors combined to lead many Nicholites to abandon the section where their families had lived for a century or more and to settle in the Deep River section of Guilford County, North Carolina.

The whereabouts of the minutes of the Nicholite Society is unknown, so that both the size and the composition of this early migration must remain conjectural. It seems probable that a small group of individuals or families made this trek southward to begin a new life and that they were joined a short time later by others from the Eastern Shore and Delaware centers. Just when this idea of starting a new life in another section of the country occurred to someone in the Society or to whom it first appeared is unknown. Perhaps it may have been Paris Chipman of Kent County, Delaware, who provided the inspiration and guidance for this migration. Chipman was one of the first Nicholites to leave the Maryland-Delaware area. Both he and Joseph Standley bought land in Guilford County in 1775, with Chipman purchasing 640 acres at this time. Or it may have been Jonathan Marine who first thought of migration as the answer to the needs of the Nicholites. There exists an old tradition handed down in the Marine family, and first made known to me by my distant cousins Miss Harriet P. Marine and Eleanor Marine Dashiell [Mrs. N. L.], that Jonathan Marine, the great-grandfather of James Whitcomb Riley, was the leader of a "Quaker"

migration of some seventy-five people from "the Eastern Shore" to North Carolina in 1774 or 1775.

We know that by 1778 the original Nicholite settlers in Guilford had been joined by such men as Alexander, James, and David Caldwell; Elisha, Levi, Michael, and William Charles; John, James, and William Horney; William Hubbard; Martin and Valentine Pegg; Thomas Twifford; and William Wheeler. Also present were Isaac Linnegar (who had farmed Nichols' Delaware farm at the time of Nichols' death) and his family and Levin Charles and his wife Mary (the widow of Joseph Nichols who had married Levin Charles sometime before August 25, 1774). The names of practically all of these people appear as witnesses to Nicholite marriages recorded in a volume still extant. By the end of 1778 almost all of these men had entered their claims to land grants in Guilford County. It seems possible that some of the half dozen members of the Harris family who applied for Guilford County land grants in this same year may also have been members of the Nicholite Society. How many of these men already possessed wives and families is not known. Yet, this must have been a sizeable community which the Nicholites established in Guilford County.

Almost all of the land grants made to the above named Nicholites were located on Deep River, Wolf's Island Creek, Reed Fork, Matrimony Creek, and Haw River. It is interesting to note that these Nicholites settled in the western part of Guilford County—a section which already had a large number of Quakers in it. Perhaps these "New Quakers" desired that in this new home which they were creating for themselves in North Carolina there might be around them Friends or Quakers, a group which had proved both sympathetic and helpful to the Nicholites in their earlier life in Maryland and Delaware.

Not long after the arrival of this body of Nicholites in Guilford County, North Carolina, there were those among them who felt the need for a meeting house of their own. At some unknown date such a building was erected near Deep River; it had already been in existence sometime when the Nicholites there were visited in the 10th month, 1789, by the well-known traveling Quaker

minister Job Scott. Probably this one meeting house was sufficient, for we read of no other such building among the North Carolina Nicholites.

North Carolina required an oath on the part of the Nicholites—something which, as we have seen, their religion did not allow them to take. Therefore, in the summer of 1778, the members of the Society of Nicholites in North Carolina drew up a petition asking for the right of affirmation and making other requests of the “Generall Assembly and authority of the State of North Carolina.”

The Nicholite petition, which gives us a partial picture of this group and its beliefs, reads as follows: “To the Generall Assembly and Authority of the State of North Carolina we the Subscribers haveing understood that we was made no mention of in the house of Assembly as a Separate people from other Sosciates and that we had not a proper right to the Affirmation provided for the Quakers administered to us according to the law Except we get a grant from your authority for it, we have thought it Convenient to lay our case before you. We being a people who is known by the name of Nicholites, not that we gave our Selves the name but the man who was first in this perswation who lived in the lower parts of pennsylvania Government on Delaware bay and died in same place, his name was Joseph Nichols and as he believed in the light that Shines in the understanding of man and woman that Discovers to them betwixt good and evil, right and wrong and reproves for evil and Justifies for well Doing to be the only Meanes of Grace to enable us to work out our Salvation, and as he believed so he preached and we amongst many other Soules became believers in the light and in a reproachful revileing manner was Called Nieholites, as much as to say followers of Nicholases light, but as to our name or religion it maketh no matter to us what name we bear if we can but be found in the true Nature thereof, is our greatest aim, we do profess and confess the same princapals that the Quakers Doth, but for Some reasons which we could render if required we hitherto have not thought it best to Joyn Membership with them, so as we have given Some small Discription

that the Affirmation is not at our refusal according to law and how we came by our Name and what we profess, we do humbly beg your authority to Consider us as a people who with Sincerety of Hearts Desires to live a Just honest peaceable quiet inafensive life before god and man and that it is not in our hearts to make any resistance against your authority nor to assist Any other authority against you, but in all things are both ready and willing to Submit our Selves to the ordinances of men in as much we Can Answer a good Conscience both before god and man, We Do humbly petition and pray you in your authority to exclude us from such things as we believe we can't be Justified before god in, which we humbly pray God almighty the great authority of both heaven and earth to give you a Sence of the honesty of our hearts in this petition it is for no other Cause the lord we pray be our Witness but purely that we may be able to Answer a good Conscience both towards god and man, which things are those we believe we can't be Just before God to bear arms or lift the sword against our fellow Creature, in Justification of which we could Mention Sundry Sayings of Christ and his apostles, and by a liveing Sence of Gods laws written on our hearts bearing witness to the Same we fear to offend him; another thing we believe we Could not be Clear in, that is to Answer the law as a Witness against any person that thereby they Shall be put to Death, which if so be you can feal bowels for us in the two above mentioned particulars—We Desire to ever be Thankful, hopeing the Lord will add to your peace for the Same, in Consquence of which we desire to Submit our Selves—peaceable Subjects under whatsoever Powers hath the rule over us in Case whereof we humbly bow and pray the great God and father of all good Gifts to endue you with his gifts and with his graces that thereby you may be able to make lawes that you may be Justified in the Makeing and we in the Full-filling. amen, in Witness wherof we have heirunto. Subscribed our Names this fourth day of the 8th Month, 1778."

This petition was signed by nine of the male Nicholites: James Caldwell, Leavin [Levin] Charles, William Charles, Paris Chipman, John Horney, William Horney, Valentine Pegg, Joseph

Standley, and William Wheeler.¹ Two Nicholites, according to a notation at the end of the petition, were appointed to "wride" down to the capital with the document in case the Assembly should wish to make any further inquiry concerning the Society.

At exactly this same time there were representatives of the Moravians and other religious groups present at the capital for the meeting of the Assembly. They were there for the same reason, seeking certain rights and privileges from the General Assembly. The arrival of the two Nicholites with their petition did not escape the attention of the Moravian representatives who were also petitioning the legislative body for the right to make an affirmation. These Moravians recorded that the Nicholites, whom they mistakenly thought to have separated from the Quakers, had come from Guilford to present a petition in which "they asked for certain privileges which, to their joy, the Assembly did not fully comprehend." The Moravians, who insisted that their cause not be "combined with that of the Nicholites, which was probably what the enemy wanted," reported that their own petition "was willingly received, was read clearly by the Under Clerk, who usually does not read well, and was heard with unusual attention and quiet." It was with "much less attention," the Moravians reported, that the Nicholite petition was received.²

The General Assembly passed a resolution on August 18, 1778, granting the requests of "Quakers, Moravians, Dunkards, and Mennonists."³ No mention, however, was made of the Nicholites in this act. Until the time that they merged with the Society of Friends, the North Carolina Nicholites continued to experience the hardships which they had hoped to have removed from them—for the members of the Assembly never did "feal bowels" for the Nicholites in the "above mentioned particulars."

The North Carolina Nicholites, living in the vicinity of Deep River, had their own business meeting each month. The two different Monthly Meetings, in North Carolina and on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, kept in close contact with each other, both by the exchange of letters and visits of ministers from one section to the other. Nicholite "ministers," like their Quaker

counterparts, were not ordained and were never paid. They were people whose spiritual gifts had been recognized by their societies which, in their business meetings, recorded these men and women as "ministers." It is recorded that the traveling ministers from the North Carolina group tended to be extremely conservative, especially in relationship to the Nicholite testimony of plainness and simplicity. This group experienced a great deal of uneasiness and concern when, in the process of time, some of the Nicholites began to substitute chairs for benches and stools which had been in use from the earliest days of the Society.⁴

When a minister moved from one Nicholite community to another in "religious service," he was required to acquaint his own Monthly Meeting with his intentions and then receive the advice and approbation of the Meeting. A minute or statement from the Monthly Meeting, stressing the unity of the Meeting with his proposed service, would accompany the traveling "friend of the ministry." Moreover, any Nicholite who changed his residence from North Carolina to Maryland or vice versa was expected to produce a "certificate of removal" from his old Monthly Meeting showing that he was in good standing with the people of his former home at the time that he decided to move on.⁵

It seems clear that there developed a much smaller settlement of Nicholites farther south than this colony at Deep River in Guilford County. The records of Deep River Monthly Meeting of Friends report that in the 10th month, 1792, Jonathan Marine and his sons (Jonathan, John, Charles, and Jesse) were received into membership by the Quakers. Jonathan's wife, Mary (Charles) Marine, and daughter Mary received Quaker membership early in 1793. Jonathan and his family are reported as living "on Gum Swamp near Little Pee Dee."⁶ This was just below the North Carolina-South Carolina border.

Another group with Nicholite connections living in this same section was the family of William Beacham [Beauchamp]. William Beaeham and his sons (Henry, John, William, Charles, Curtis, Levi, Ellick, Matthew, and Russ), living near "Gum

Swamp on Little Pee Dee," were received into the Society of Friends in 1792; and Elizabeth Beacham and her daughter, Milcha became Quakers in 1795.⁷

Still another Nicholite known to have lived in this same section was Isaae Linnegar, the "part-colored man" who had married the ex-slave Rosannah and who in 1770 had farmed Joseph Nichols' land in Kent County, Delaware. Isaac asked to be received into membership at the Deep River Monthly Meeting of Friends in 6th month, 1798. This application was referred up through New Garden Quarterly Meeting to North Carolina Yearly Meeting which ruled that the Discipline was clear on this point. Thus, on the 1st of the 6th month, 1801, Isaac Linnegar [Linagar], was received into membership by Deep River Monthly Meeting of Friends. About this same time Piney Grove Monthly Meeting was set up in this area of "Gum Swamp near Little Pee Dee," and Isaac Linnegar had connections with this meeting from 1803 to 1817.⁸

The Deep River Nicholite community in North Carolina was much larger and more stable than the younger and smaller one at "Gum Swamp near Little Pee Dee," just over the line in South Carolina. Several families had settled in the Deep River area in 1774/1775, and a much larger group had arrived in 1778. Other Nicholites from the Delaware-Maryland area, such as Major Anderson (son of James Anderson of Kent County, Delaware), arrived from time to time during the years following. These, in all probability, more than made up for the number lost to the much smaller community in South Carolina.

The North Carolina Nicholites continued to exist as an organized society down to the very end of the eighteenth century. Job Scott visited them in 1789. He was followed by other Quaker ministers who left accounts of the Nicholites in their journals: John Wigham in 1795, Joshua Evans in 1797, and Stephen Grellet in 1800. After Stephen Grellet's visit to the Deep River Nicholites in 1800, they drop out of sight, disappearing as a separate

religious body. It must be that the North Carolina Nicholites followed the example of their brethren back in Maryland and Delaware and merged with the Society of Friends.

Notes

1 — This Nicholite Petition is to be found at the State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina.

2 — Adelaide L. Fries (ed.), **Records of the Moravians in North Carolina** (Raleigh, 1926), III, 1379.

3 — **Ibid.**, III, 1383.

4 — **Friend's Miscellany**, IV, 250.

5 — See the rules of discipline which are reproduced in the fourth chapter of this work, especially numbers seven and eight. These practices were taken over from the Quakers.

6 — William W. Hinshaw, **Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy** (Ann Arbor, 1936-1950), I, 826.

7 — **Ibid.**, I, 826.

8 — **Ibid.**, I, 824. See also Henry J. Cadbury, "Negro Membership in the Society of Friends," **Journal of Negro History**, XXI (1936), 177. We should note that Jarvis Staford and his family also moved from the Delmarva area southward into the Carolinas and eventually joined the Society of Friends.

CHAPTER VI

THE NICHOLITES BECOME QUAKERS

The Nicholite Society in Delaware, Maryland, North and South Carolina had only a brief life, lasting down to the close of the eighteenth century or into the opening years of the nineteenth century. At first thought it seems strange that its being was so brief. But added reflection brings a sense of surprise that the Nicholites existed as a separate society as long as they did.

Almost from the very time of the organization of the movement in 1774, shortly after the death of Joseph Nichols, there was a realization that a great similarity between the Nicholites and the Society of Friends existed. In their petition to the General Assembly of North Carolina (reproduced in Chapter V) the Nicholites had claimed that "We do profess and Confess the same principals that the Quakers Doth, but for some reasons which we could render if required we hitherto have not thought it best to Joyn Membership with them."

We have seen that the basic beliefs of the two groups were essentially the same: emphasis upon the inner light, pacifism, plainness, and opposition to a "hireling ministry." The whole pattern of the Nicholite organization was based, consciously and unconsciously, upon that of the Society of Friends: the meeting for worship, the monthly business meeting, the wedding ceremony, certificates of removal, etc. Even much of the terminology of the Nicholites was Quaker in origin. This can be seen rather clearly in the Nicholite practice of calling days and months by number rather than by name and in their use of "friends" as a name for themselves.

Yet, there were also differences. The Nicholites placed heavy emphasis (too heavy, the Quakers sometimes felt) upon plainness so that it became a sort of fetish, often seeming to become an object of worship to those who forgot the real reason behind this testimony. Job Scott, well-known Quaker minister who visited the Nicholites in both Maryland and North Carolina in 1789 and 1790, recorded in his *Journal* that he was "much

distressed on account of the extreme formality which prevails among this people. They trust in themselves that they are righteous and despise others. This is too general among this people. Though truly, I do believe that there is a remnant of true, inward Christians among them — humble hearted followers of the Lamb. May they keep their eye so single, as to be further enlightened, till their whole body be full of light; then will they, I firmly believe, see clearly beyond that lifeless, superstitious dependence on outward exactness, which so much abounds in many of their minds, greatly to the easing out or preventing of true Christian charity. Alas! This is the very disposition our Saviour complained of, as shutting up the kingdom of heaven. It indeed does so, and prevents the individuals themselves, and those under their influence, from entering into a lively inward enjoyment of the coming, and the power thereof in the soul. I plainly saw them sitting in the outward court (as too many are in our own meetings) though in silence; many of them knowing little or nothing of true inward temple worship, in spirit and in truth, under the lively influence of the live coal from the holy altar.”¹

At the beginning of their existence as an organized society, the Nicholites were more advanced on the subject of slavery than were the Friends; but within a few short years this difference ceased to exist, for both Maryland and North Carolina Quakers made slave-holding a disownable offence.² Still another way in which Nicholites varied from their Quaker neighbors was in their practice of holding their business meeting with men and women seated together instead of following the Friends’ custom of holding separate men’s and women’s meetings for business.

From the very beginning of the Nicholite movement there existed, in spite of a few differences in degree or practice, this great similarity between the Nicholites and the Friends. It was only natural that the followers of Joseph Nichols and the Quakers should feel a certain kinship with each other and that their association with one another should continue with the passing of time. As has already been seen, many Nicholites attended the meetings which John Woolman held with both

Maryland and Delaware Quakers in 1766. Long after Nichols was dead and his followers had organized formally and erected their own meeting houses, many of the Nicholites continued to meet from time to time with Friends.

At the same time that the Nicholites were coming together with the Quakers, we find a movement in the opposite direction. Countless traveling Friends who were visiting Quaker centers often included the Nicholites or "New Quakers" in the religious journeys that they had undertaken. Therefore, some of our earliest accounts of the Nicholites and their movement come to us from the journals which these traveling Quaker ministers kept. A list of such visitors after John Woolman would include Isaae Martin, Richard Jordan, Martha Routh, Elias Hicks, Job Scott, John Wigham, Joshua Evans, and Stephen Grellet.

The Nicholites must have been in the thoughts of their Quaker neighbors also. This appears to have been particularly true of those Quakers who belonged to Third Haven Monthly Meeting on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. At this time Third Haven Monthly Meeting included the following Weekly or Preparative Meetings: Third Haven, Tuckahoe, Bayside, and Choptank in Talbot County; and Marshy Creek and Queen Anne's (or, as it was later called, Greensboro) in Caroline County. An examination of the records of Third Haven Monthly Meeting shows that on the 25th of the 3rd month, 1784, John Regester expressed a concern to pay a "religious visit" to the Nicholites and received a minute to this effect from the Monthly Meeting. It was evidently some time later that he made this journey, for the minute was not returned until the 29th of the 12th month, 1785.

A few years later, on the 29th of the 10th month, 1789, Mary Berry informed Third Haven Monthly Meeting of a prospect of "some religious service" to the Nicholites. This Mary Berry (1731-1806) was an esteemed minister of the Society of Friends and traveled widely in "religious service." In 1792 she visited the Virginia and North Carolina Yearly Meetings. In 1793, accompanied by Tristram Needles and Martha Yarnell, she visited some of the Friends' meetings on the Western Shore of

Maryland and in Virginia, most of the meetings in North Carolina and all of the Quaker meetings in South Carolina and Georgia. A short time later, in 1795, she expressed a desire to go to the West Indies, but, because of war conditions, was unable to make the journey. When Mary Berry proposed this visit to the Nicholites in 1789, Rebeccah Bartlett, John Dickinson, and Solomon Charles (a former Nicholite) expressed a "freedom" to accompany her. Their journey took place very soon after this, for their travel minute was returned to the following monthly business meeting.³

Almost from the very beginning of the Society of Nicholites some of the group that Nichols had left behind found their discipline too straight and decided to move over into the Society of Friends. Solomon Charles was accepted into membership by the Quakers on the 28th of the 11th month, 1779. His five children and step-daughter were accepted as members shortly thereafter. Levin Wright and his wife came "under the notice of friends in order to become members of our religious Society" on the 26th of the 5th month, 1791, and were received as members one month later.⁴ In addition to these, there were undoubtedly others who applied to Third Haven through Marshy Creek Meeting for membership in the Society of Friends. The same development was also taking place in Delaware, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

One other "catalytic agent" may be mentioned here, as we try to understand some of the developments that led up to the Nicholite decision to merge with the Society of Friends. This would be the dying off of many of the older and more substantial members of the Nicholite movement. An examination of the wills for Caroline County, Maryland (where the Nicholites were most heavily concentrated) shows the deaths of William Harris in 1784; Levin Wright in 1785; William Kelley in 1787; William Stevens in 1790; Thomas Willis and Roger Wright in 1792; Thomas Stanton in 1793; Joshua Chileutt, Nehemiah Saulsbury, and James Horney in 1794; Henry Ward, Jonathan Wilson (Willson), Daniel Ward, John Harvey, and William Dawson in 1795; Solomon Wilson and Lemuel Wright in 1796; and Henry

Swiggett in 1798. Examination of the records of Kent County, Delaware, shows the deaths of Benjamin Chipman in 1772; David Hillford in 1774; Zachariah Goforth in 1779; Richard Eckels (Eccles) in 1783; Sarah Goforth in 1785; James Anderson in 1791; Ann Eckels (Eccles) and Richard Eckels, Jr., in 1796.⁵

All of the above factors added up to produce a very important development. The more discerning Nicholites came to believe that it might tend to be of mutual benefit if they could bring about a union of their group with the Society of Friends. Their reading of Friends' books and their frequent association with both traveling Friends and their Quaker neighbors had shown these "New Quakers" that the two groups were one in the vital, fundamental principles of their religious beliefs. There arose, then, among some of the Nicholites the desire to merge their movement with the Society of Friends.

Among those Nicholites who were interested in the possibility of a union with Friends was James Harris, a highly esteemed member of the Nicholites who had given the movement much of its leadership since Joseph Nichols had died at the close of 1770. In addition to being one of their oldest members, Harris was also a minister among the Nicholites; he was thought of as a person "favoured with a spiritual discerning and stability in the truth."⁶ Out of a serious concern over the situation of the Nicholites James Harris sometimes mentioned the possibility of merging with the Society of Friends to his fellow Nicholites. Great opposition to any such move, however, arose among his co-religionists.

Many of the neighbors of the Nicholites advised them against such a union with the Society of Friends, for they feared that the Nicholites would relax in their self-denying course and in the integrity of their behavior. The neighbors felt that the Nicholites had "manifested by their lives, deportment, conversation, and intercourse among men, the excellency of that principle which they made profession of, so that their upright and self-denying appearance, connected with their upright and charitable lives, furnished an example which was not without its effect on the neighborhood and country in which they live."⁷

As a result of the opposition which arose to this suggestion that the Nicholite Society join the Society of Friends, James Harris seems to have put aside the idea for some time, although he could not forget it. For some years, we are told, it "occasioned him deep exercise," so that he became more and more convinced that such a union would be "the Lord's work." Eventually James Harris and those who followed his leadership proposed at their Monthly Meeting that this union of the two societies take place. The Nicholite Society was not yet ready to accept such a proposal. The stricter members were opposed to the union because they feared that the members "would feel at liberty to take greater indulgences, than while they remained separate." When first made, then, the proposition did not meet with approval. After a lapse of more than a year, the suggestion was revived and once more was defeated. By this time, however, the opposition had decreased very perceptibly. After the passing of a few months, the idea was advanced for a third time and still later for a fourth. Upon each occasion the opposition to this move became increasingly weaker.⁸

It is difficult to tell just when James Harris and his group were able to start this idea of union to spread among their fellow Nicholites. Isaac Martin, who visited the Eastern Shore Nicholites during the 8th month, 1794, found that "a great part of them are desirous of joining Friends, but others are opposed to it." Because the Nicholites were concerned that unity should be maintained among themselves as they dealt with this question, Isaac Martin was convinced that the subject would require time and patience for a satisfactory solution to be arrived at. Martin's recommendation, therefore, was for them to take the time and to exercise the patience needed.⁹ Martha Routh, visiting the Nicholites in 1796, wrote in her Journal that "an apprehension took place, that they should not long be a distinct society from Friends."¹⁰

Finally it was clearly seen that the great majority of the Nicholites were in favor of a union with the Society of Friends. Those who were opposed to the measure then proposed that those among the Nicholites who were ready to join the Quakers

should make application for membership in the Society of Friends. Those who were not prepared to seek Friends' membership should remain as they were. It was the feeling of the group which opposed union that such a development as they were now suggesting would produce in the future the positive result of causing themselves to examine seriously their own situation and that, eventually, they also might be prepared to join those who were now about to become members of the Society of Friends.¹¹

At the very time that the Nicholites had agreed that a separation should take place, there occurred a development which caused the group seeking Quaker membership to postpone its application to be received into the Society of Friends. There had arisen among the Nicholites, just prior to this period, several persons new in the ministry, people whose appearance in the ministry was not generally approved. One of these persons sought to introduce singing into the Nicholite services of worship. This unidentified person was probably one of the people won over from the Methodists, a development which we noted in Chapter IV as causing both Bishop Asbury and Freeborn Garrettson to become somewhat angry. Methodism, which was sweeping the Delmarva Peninsula at the end of the eighteenth century, was marked by its emphasis on singing. The Nicholites felt that singing of "set" hymns (a sort of secondhand religious experience) was not consistent with their dependence upon the leading of the Spirit. They, therefore, would not allow the introduction of singing.

This small group of new ministers and their followers also opposed the acceptance and administration of a written discipline which the Nicholites had adopted in 1793 (see Chapter IV). They claimed that each person had the right and privilege to follow the dictates of his own mind and conscience, rather than permitting any other person to control him or submitting to the rules of the Nicholite Society. These views found acceptance among some members of the Society of Nicholites, but a far greater proportion of the Society disapproved of them. There arose a general feeling that if these new ministers and the few

who followed them could not be brought to "a proper sense of the tendency thereof," they should be disowned.¹²

This was the situation which arose among the Nicholites at the very time that the separation had been agreed upon. Now it was felt that those who were to remain in the old society would be so reduced in membership that they might not be able to deal with this "libertine spirit" which had suddenly appeared among them. For this reason they asked their friends who were about to leave them to remain as Nicholites long enough for some satisfactory handling of this problem to be worked out. Those Nicholites who were desirous of becoming Quakers accepted this plea and remained in the old movement until two of the unsatisfactory persons who had appeared in the ministry without the approval of the society, and who had continued to refuse the advice of their brethren, were disowned. It was then felt that conditions were satisfactory for the separation to take place in the way that had been agreed upon.¹³

The application of this group of Nicholites for acceptance into the Society of Friends is recorded in the minutes of Third Haven Monthly Meeting for the 12th of the 10th month, 1797. Ezra Michener, a century ago, reported that on a loose sheet in one of the record books he found a document which he felt conveyed the feeling of the applying Nicholites much better than that one recorded in the Third Haven minutes. This earlier application, as recorded by Michener, read as follows: "Whereas, a part and perhaps the greater part, of the people in session, called Nicholites, have had a concern, at sundry times, to be united with the people called Quakers, believing it might be a benefit to us, and, we trust, no hurt to them, and perhaps more generally useful to others; and under this apprehension and prospect of good being done, we have believed it to be our duty to inform you of the desire, we have to be one with you, truly united to the Head of the True Church, and one to another; so have proceeded to enroll the names of those who desire the unity proposed should be brought about. The next larger number is those that see not their way into the matter, but are not inclined to oppose. We have also sent forward the names of

those that have a birthright only who unite with the matter. Given forth from Centre Monthly Meeting, held the 5th of the eighth month, 1797, and signed on behalf of the same, by Seth Hill Evitts, Clerk." Miehener then described the three lists mentioned above: "First, one of eighty names, 'all of whieh is agreed to the aforesaid proposal.' Next, one of twenty names, marked 'neuter;' and one of twelve names, marked 'nominal.' The first list is headed by James Harris."¹⁴

For some unknown reason the application found by Miehener and quoted above was not submitted but was replaced by another one almost two months later. In the minutes of Third Haven Meeting there is found a petition dated the 30th day of the 9th month, 1797, and reading as follows: "To the members of Third Haveu Monthly Meeting to be held the 25th day of the 10th month, 1797, we the people called Nicollites herein present to your view and serious consideration the names of those who incline to unite with you in membership."¹⁵ This application or petition bears the following names: James Anderson and wife, Celia; Celia Bartlett; Esther Bartlett; Edward Barton and wife, Anne; John Barton; Mary Ann Barton; James Boon and wife, Mary; Esther Chanee; Elijah Charles; Euphama Charles; Mary Charles; Willis Charles and wife, Sarah; Esther Chileutt; Margaret Connelly;

Elisha Dawson and wife, Lydia; John Dawson and wife, Anne; Anne Emmerson; Samuel Emmerson; Seth Hill Evitts; George Hardy Fisher and son, Daniel; Riehard Foxwell; Elizabeth Frampton; William Frampton and wife, Margaret; Preston Godwin, wife, Tabitha and sons, Henry and Seth; Thomas Gray and wife, Sarah; William Gray, wife, Elizabeth and daughters, Anna and Lovey; Catherine Harvey; James Harris, wife, Mary and son, Peter; Jesse Hubert and wife, Prissilla; Sarah Jenkins; Dennis Kelly and wife, Hannah; Solomon Kenton; Moses Leverton and wife, Rachel; Anne Love; William Melona and wife, Sophia; James Murpha and wife, Mary; William Murpha and wife, Ruth;

William Peters; William Poits, wife, Ada and daughter, Sarah; Levin Pool and wife, Elizabeth; John Pritchett; Mary

Richardson; Archabald Ross and wife, Elizabeth; Elijah Russel and wife, Esther; Jonathan Shannahan and wife, Margaret; Mary Stevens; Johnson Swiggett and wife, Mary; Sarah Swiggett; Elizabeth Twiford; Richard Vickers and wife, Celia; Sarah Vickers; Anthony Wheatly and wife, Sophia; James Wilson and wife, Sarah; Rebeccah Wilson; William Wilson, son, John and daughter, Anne; Daniel Wright and wife, Sarah; Elizabeth Wright and daughter, Mary; Hatfield Wright and wife, Lucrecia; Jacob Wright and wife, Rhoda; James Wright and wife, Sarah; John Wright and wife, Esther.

This application of the above named Nicholites who were seeking membership in the Society of Friends was presented to the representatives of the Marshy Creek Preparative Meeting, near what is now Preston, Maryland, and they in turn submitted it to Third Haven Monthly Meeting for action. This application came from "Centre Monthly Meeting of the people called Nicollites" and was signed by Seth Hill Evitts, Clerk.

Upon receipt of this application from the Nicholites, Third Haven Monthly Meeting appointed a committee of its own members "to take Opportunity with them in a Collective Capacity and treat the matter with them as way may open as to the ground of their request and report of their situation and state of unat in regard thereof to our next Monthly Meeting." The committee then reported back on the 16th of the 11th month, 1797, that, "Many of them expressing in a tender manner their desire of becoming united with friends in a Society connection as Truth may open the way thereto, which Appears to be their prevailing Sentament, although some few have not given in to the proposal. We may further observe that most of them are Situated so remote from any of our meetings as renders the frequent attendance of them impractical, that they have three meeting houses where they meet together for their keeping up those meetings we did not see ocation to throw any discouragement before them. But are of the opinion it may be proper to represent the cause to the Quarterly meeting for their advice and assistance."¹⁶

Southern Quarterly Meeting of Friends, made up of Quaker

meetings in Kent and Sussex Counties in Delaware and in Kent, Caroline, and Talbot Counties in Maryland, felt that it would be advisable to visit the Nicholites individually or by families "in order to feel after their growth and standing in the Truth." Third Haven Meeting appointed a committee for this purpose and was assisted in the task by a committee also set up by the Quarterly Meeting. Early in 1798, on the 11th of the 1st month, the committee reported back that it felt "free" that sixty-nine of the Nicholites should be received into membership by the Quakers. At this same time a small number of additional Nicholites applied for membership in the Society of Friends; and later, within the next year and a half, four other groups of Nicholites (ranging in size from three to thirteen) requested that they be received into the Society of Friends as members.¹⁷ It was about this same time that Elias Hicks wrote a letter to his wife and said that he "could understand the hesitation of some, and hoped that those who did join the Meetings would not 'be hurt by the great and prevailing deficiencies manifested' among the Quakers whose Society they joined."¹⁸ The new members seemed satisfied with their new spiritual home, for the minutes of Third Haven Monthly Meeting (and later of Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting) show that a number of people who had come from the old Nicholite Society asked to have their children taken into the Society of Friends as members.

Following this acceptance of many of the Nicholites into membership by Third Haven Monthly Meeting there came into existence a very interesting relationship between those who remained Nicholites and those who had chosen to withdraw and become Quakers. The three meeting houses which the old group had possessed were in the name of the Nicholite Society. Those who had left the Nicholites to become Quakers felt that they had forfeited, by this move, any claims which they had possessed to these buildings. Those who remained Nicholites thought differently, however, and therefore allowed all to continue to meet together for worship in two of their meeting houses, Centre and Northwest Fork. The only change required was that their mid-week meetings be held on different days, so that the Nicholites

might continue to hold their business meetings among themselves. The two groups, Nicholite and Quaker, continued to worship together as they had done in the past when they were still one body.¹⁹

This development, so unusual among separating church groups, was of far-reaching significance. With the passing of time there came the opportunity for the remaining Nicholites to examine the effect which this union with the Society of Friends had made upon their former brethren. They discovered that it had not produced the "pernicious" consequences that had been feared. Those who had become Quakers "continued to be distinguished by their former plainness, simplicity, self-denial, and upright walking among men."²⁰ This opened the way for still others of the remaining Nicholites to seek entrance into the Society of Friends.

Within a short time following the acceptance of this great number of Nicholites as members, Third Haven Monthly Meeting received word on the 17th of the 5th month, 1798, that "From Marshee Creek they inform us that the friends belonging to Centre and Northwest Fork Meetings (Two Meetings of the people called Nicholites, the members of whom being now nearly all united with friends), request that Meetings for Worship may be established at each of those places and also preparative Meetings established." This request was taken to the Quarterly Meeting and four months later the concurrence of the Quarterly Meeting was obtained. A short time later it was felt that a separate Monthly Meeting would best serve the interests of the Quakers in the central and southern sections of Caroline County; therefore, Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting came into existence on the 16th of the 7th month, 1800, and contained the three Weekly or Preparative Meetings of Northwest Fork, Centre, and Marshy Creek.²¹

As time progressed and the Nicholite Society grew increasingly smaller, the Nicholites decided to ask Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting of Friends to appoint trustees who would accept the titles to the two meeting houses at Centre and Northwest Fork. Northwest Fork meeting house, near Federalsburg, was

transferred to the Quakers in 8th month, 1799. The meeting house at Centre, however, was not made over until the end of 1803, when Elijah Cromeen (Cromeen), Clerk of the Nicholite Society, recorded on the 31st of the 12th month, 1803, that Centre meeting house had been transferred to the Society of Friends.²² Either no agreement was worked out about the meeting house at Tuckahoe Neck, near Denton, or else it was destroyed; the Quakers built a meeting house there in 1802, after meeting in the house of James Wilson (a former Nicholite) starting in 1798. This meeting house still stands today on the northern side of the highway on the western approach to Denton.

How long a separate Nicholite Society continued to exist is uncertain. Seth Hill Evitts, the Nicholite Clerk at the time of the earliest application, was accepted into membership by Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting on the 11th of the 11th month, 1801. Beauchamp Stanton and Elijah Cromeen both applied for membership in 11th month, 1804, and were received into membership in 1805. In 1806 Elisha Dawson (son of William Dawson), a former Nicholite who became a well-known Quaker minister and who traveled widely in his work—going to Ohio, Indiana, New England, and even making one trip to Europe—decided to visit “divers of the remaining part of the society called Nicholites.” On this religious visit he was accompanied by Hatfield Wright, William Gray, Edward Barton, and Dennis Kelley, all of whom had been Nicholites before becoming Quakers. Elisha Dawson is the source for much of the material appearing in early nineteenth century accounts of the Nicholites. Elizabeth Twiford, who became a widely respected minister among Friends and who traveled among Friends of Baltimore, Ohio, and Indiana Yearly Meetings, and her husband, Jonathan Twiford, did not become Friends until the 10th of the 2nd month, 1819.²³

It appears probable that a small number of Nicholites never actually joined the Society of Friends although the two groups met regularly together for worship. Many years ago Wilson Tylor wrote that he remembered very well a “quaint old bachelor” named Elisha Wilson who attended Tuckahoe Neck meeting house near Denton but never wanted to be a member

of the Society of Friends. This man, whom Wilson Tylor reports to have been called the last living representative of the Nicholites, died during the Civil War.²⁴

The Nicholites had only a brief existence. The "New Quakers" became Quakers, so that few traces of the old movement remain. Knowledge of the Nicholite Society has become such a fading tradition in the areas where the Society once waxed strong, that many who were born and have grown up in these localities have never heard of this unusual sect which once flourished on the Delmarva Peninsula and which gave birth to the two smaller bodies in North and South Carolina.

Notes

1 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 262.

2 — See Thomas E. Drake, **Quakers and Slavery in America** (New Haven, 1950), pp. 81-84; Kenneth L. Carroll, "Maryland Quakers and Slavery," **Maryland Historical Magazine**, XLV (1950), 215-225, and "Religious Influences on the Manumission of Slaves in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties," **Maryland Historical Magazine**, LVI (1961), 176-186.

3 — Third Haven Minutes, III, 189, 264.

4 — *Ibid.*, III, 74, 105, 287.

5 — Caroline County Willis, Liber JR#B, Folios 3-7, 41-43, 77-79, 167-168, 208-209, 211-212, 229-231, 239-240, 245-246, 271-274, 288-292, 341-343, 351-353, 359-361, 429-432. These wills often called for certain Nicholites to serve as trustees of the estate or to provide valuations of the estate. The two names appearing most often for these functions or as witnesses are those of James Harris and Seth Hill Evitts. See also **Calendar of Kent County Delaware Probate Records 1680-1800** (Dover, 1944), pp. 267, 294, 322, 350, 376, 441, 506.

6 — **Memorials**, p. 85.

7 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 250.

8 — **Memorials**, p. 86; **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 252; Janney, *op. cit.*, III, 497.

9 — Isaac Martin, **A Journal of the Life, Travels, Labours and Religious Exercises of Isaac Martin, Late of Rahway, in East Jersey, Deceased** (Philadelphia, 1834), pp. 54-55.

10 — Martha Routh, **Memoir of the Life, Travels, and Religious Experiences of Martha Routh, Written by Herself, or Compiled from Her Own Narrative** (New York, 1832), p. 174.

11 — **Friends' Miscellany**, IV, 252; Janney, *op. cit.*, III, 497; Michener, *op. cit.*, p. 422.

- 12 — Friends' Miscellany, IV, 255.
- 13 — Ibid., IV, 256.
- 14 — Michener, *op. cit.*, p. 423.
- 15 — Third Haven Minutes, III, 368.
- 16 — Ibid., IV, 1-2.
- 17 — Ibid., IV, 4: Minutes of Southern Quarterly Meeting for Men, I (1759-1822), 294, record the following appointees to this committee: Daniel Cowgill, Warner Mifflin, Robert Holliday, James Maslin, Samuel Howell, Isaiah Rowland, Thomas Berry, Clayton Cowgill, and John Herons. Minutes of Southern Quarterly Meeting for Women, I (1756-1816), 127, add the following names: Jane Offley, Anne Mifflin, Ann Rasin, Mary Cowgill, Sarah Mifflin, Ruth Rowland, Susanna Hunn, Cassandra Corse, and Sarah Cowgill. Both of these volumes are in the Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.
- 18 — Bliss Forbush, **Elias Hicks, Quaker Liberal** (New York, 1956), p. 101, cites this letter.
- 19 — Friends' Miscellany, IV, 253-254; Janney, *op. cit.*, III, 498; Minutes of Southern Quarterly Meeting for Men, I, 302, record that "that the greater part being very remote from any of our Meetings, it became the concern of this Committee united with the Monthly Meeting to attend to their Situation in that respect, it was therefore thought right to indulge them in holding Meetings for worship at their three Meetinghouses that had belonged to that Society of People, after obtaining full liberty from such of them as had not applied, which meetings have been held at two of said Houses every since, twice in the week."
- 20 — Janney, *op. cit.*, III, 498; Friends' Miscellany, IV, 254.
- 21 — Third Haven Minutes, IV, 11-12, 16; Northwest Fork Minutes, I, 1.
- 22 — The transfer of these two meeting houses to the Society of Friends is recorded in the volume which contains the Nicholite birth records.
- 23 — Northwest Fork Minutes, I, 75, 82, 93, 96, 243.
- 24 — Ernest Neall Wright, **Peter Wright and Mary Anderson: A Family Record** (Ann Arbor, 1939), p. 127. This book contains a brief article on the Nicholites by Wilson Tylor.

APPENDIX

- Part I: Nicholite Birth Records**
- Part II: Nicholite Marriages**
- Part III: Witnesses to Nicholite
Marriages**
- Part IV: Nicholites Admitted into
the Society of Friends**
- Part V: Nicholite Wills**

PART I
NICHOLITE BIRTH RECORDS

PART I
NICHOLITE BIRTH RECORDS

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Addams, Esther	Daniel and Sarah	8/- -/1766
Anderson, Daniel	James and Ann	10/3/1771
Anderson, Elic	James and Ann	11/4/1783
Anderson, Elijah	James and Ann	8/29/1773
Anderson, James	James and Ann	8/16/1765
Anderson, Isaac	James and Ann	8/6/1769
Anderson, Major	James and Ann	11/27/1777
Anderson, Mary	James and Ann	1/6/1775
Barton, Andrew	Edward and Ann	12/2/1789
Barton, Ann	William and Elizabeth	1/12/1783
Barton, Anna	Edward and Ann	4/11/1793
Barton, Elizabeth	James and Mary Ann	8/23/1792
Barton, James	William and Elizabeth	5/20/1785
Barton, Jane	James and Mary Ann	8/23/1792
Barton, John	James and Mary Ann	1/27/1783
Barton, Levin	Edward and Ann	9/4/1793
Barton, Lydia	Edward and Ann	12/29/1787
Barton, Peter	William and Elizabeth	4/29/1788
Barton, Rhoda	William and Elizabeth	6/26/1791
Barton, Sarah	James and Mary Ann	7/23/1784
Barton, Thomas	James and Mary Ann	11/18/1789
Barton, William	James and Mary Ann	10/1/1787
Batchelder, Liddy	John and Eleanor	2/10/1773
Batchelder, William	William and Naomi	7/27/1775
Batchelor, John	John and Elenor	12/16/1781
Berry, Adar	William and Naomi	5/30/1762
Berry, Delilah	William and Naomi	7/21/1759
Berry, Littleton	William and Naomi	1/18/1758
Bishop, Aaron	Robert and Elenor	11/23/1769
Bishop, Ariminta	Robert and Elenor	5/2/1783
Bishop, Eleanor	William and Sarah	12/16/1773
Bishop, Frances	William and Sarah	3/3/1778
Bishop, James	Robert and Elendor	8/14/1771
Bishop, James	William and Sarah	9/4/1793
Bishop, John	Robert and Elenor	11/18/1773
Bishop, John	William and Sarah	5/10/1791
Bishop, Levin	Robert and Eleanor	8/22/1786
Bishop, Lydia	William and Sarah	1/15/1787
Bishop, Mary	Robert and Eleanor	5/31/1778
Bishop, Mary	William and Sarah	11/4/1783
Bishop, Nathan	William and Sarah	9/22/1775
Bishop, Rachel	Robert and Elenor	1/31/1776
Bishop, Robert	William and Sarah	12/12/1788
Bishop, Sarah	William and Sarah	3/15/1780
Bishop, William	Robert and Elenor	12/17/1780
Bishop, William	William and Sarah	9/15/1784
Carner, Aron	Joshua and Marget	4/22/1761
Charles, Caleb	Isaac and Saphier	4/12/1780
Charles, Daniel	Isaac and Ann	9/17/1773
Charles, Elijah	Jacob and Eufama	8/28/1770
Charles, Eufama	Jacob and Eufama	3/26/1773

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Charles, Henry	Jacob and Euphama	7/9/1768
Charles, Isaac	Isaac and Ann	10/4/1775
Charles, Isaac	William and Leah	11/15/1773
Charles, Jacob	Isaac and Ann	7/1/1768
Charles, Jacob	Jacob and Eufama	7/15/1780
Charles, Jacob	William and Leah	5/17/1776
Charles, John	Solomon and Sarah	11/8/1763
Charles, Levin	Solomon and Sarah	1/1/1766
Charles, Lovey	Solomon and Sarah	5/2/1762
Charles, Nuton	Solomon and Sarah	3/24/1768
Charles, Ruben	William and Leah	4/20/1771
Charles, Sarah	Jacob and Eufama	4/25/1775
Charles, Solomon	Solomon and Sarah	10/22/1770
Charles, William	Isaac and Sophia	5/17/1783
Charles, Willis	Jacob and Euphama	3/13/1766
Chilcut, Celia	Joshua and Esther	9/23/1772
Chilcut, Cloe	Joshua and Esther	11/16/1766
Chilcut, Esther	Joshua and Esther	7/30/1774
Chilcut, Mary	Joshua and Esther	12/8/1764
Chilcut, Rhoda	Joshua and Esther	10/14/1770
Chilcutt, Anna	Joshua and Esther	6/23/1784
Chilcutt, John	Joshua and Esther	4/29/1782
Chilcutt, Peter	Joshua and Esther	4/12/1780
Chilcutt, Phebe	Joshua and Esther	2/1/1778
Covey, Ann	Noble and Rachel	3/10/1764
Covey, Rachel	Noble and Rachel	11/5/1774
Covey, Rebeca	Noble and Rachel	4/10/1766
Covey, Sarah	Noble and Rachel	11/11/1771
Cromeann, Andrew	Elijah and Sarah	9/2/1783
Cromeann, Beachamp	Elijah and Sarah	1/28/1782
Cromeann, Blades	Elijah and Sarah	3/2/1788
Cromeann, Dorcas	Elijah and Sarah	3/2/1790
Cromeann, Rhoda	Elijah and Sarah	1/3/1786
Cromeann, Tristram	Elijah and Sarah	11/26/1780
Cromeen, Elijah	Elijah and Sarah	9/2/1771
Cromeen, James	Elijah and Sarah	12/27/1775
Cromeen, Joseph	Elijah and Sarah	11/26/1778
Cromeen, Levin	Elijah and Sarah	10/29/1769
Cromeen, Lovey	Elijah and Sarah	4/20/1773
Cromeen, Thomas	Elijah and Sarah	4/11/1768
Dawson, Daniel	Elisha and Lydia	11/9/1786
Dawson, Deborah	Elisha and Lydia	9/22/1789
Dawson, William	Elisha and Lydia	3/29/1796
Eccles, Anna	Richard and Ann	5/20/1771
Eccles, Anthony	Richard and Ann	12/17/1765
Eccles, Elic	Richard and Ann	11/20/1783
Eccles, Esther	Richard and Ann	8/5/1778
Eccles, John	Richard and Ann	6/21/1763
Eccles, Julana	Richard and Ann	3/14/1781
Eccles, Lydda	Richard and Ann	2/18/1776
Eccles, Mary	Richard and Ann	4/16/1761
Eccles, Richard	Richard and Ann	3/5/1773
Eccles, Sarah	Richard and Ann	11/3/1758
Evitts, Ann	Seth Hill and Naomi	11/9/1783
Evitts, Sarah	Seth Hill and Naomi	6/13/1779

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Fisher, Alexander	George H. and Rachel	5/11/1786
Fisher, Allfare	George H. and Rachel	7/1/1779
Fisher, Daniel	George H. and Rachel	6/21/1772
Fisher, Frances	George H. and Rachel	10/20/1765
Fisher, George	George H. and Rachel	4/4/1782
Fisher, John	George H. and Rachel	2/17/1768
Fisher, Levicey	George H. and Rachel	4/22/1769
Fisher, Robert	George H. and Rachel	4/17/1784
Fisher, Sarah	George H. and Rachel	8/19/1774
Foster, Anne	Joseph and Mary	1/19/1769
Foster, Elizabeth	Joseph and Mary	8/22/1763
Foster, Mary	Joseph and Mary	5/14/1776
Foster, Peter	Joseph and Mary	9/21/1757
Foster, Thomas	Joseph and Mary	9/1/1773
Frampton, Hubird	Thomas and Ann	8/4/1768
Frampton, Isaac	William and Margaret	7/28/1782
Frampton, Levin	Thomas and Ann	7/1/1765
Gray, Anna	William and Elizabeth	3/13/1772
Gray, Elizabeth	William and Elizabeth	7/13/1784
Gray, Esther	William and Elizabeth	9/23/1781
Gray, Jacob	William and Elizabeth	6/21/1794
Gray, Joseph	William and Elizabeth	11/15/1779
Gray, Lovey	William and Elizabeth	8/1/1774
Gray, Lydia	William and Elizabeth	7/11/1786
Gray, Perry	William and Elizabeth	11/29/1777
Gray, Sarah	William and Elizabeth	3/10/1792
Gray, William	William and Elizabeth	5/26/1789
Goslin, Daniel	Ezekiel and Marget	6/22/1769
Goslin, Esther	Ezekiel and Marget	11/22/1772
Harvey, Celia	John and Sophia	6/5/1782
Harvey, John	John and Sophia	12/4/1779
Harvey, Mary	John and Sophia	5/4/1774
Harvey, Rhoda	John and Sophia	11/2/1783
Harvey, Samuel	John and Sophia	1/15/1777
Harris, Ann	James and Mary	12/9/1760
Harris, Ann	William and Ann	3/4/1769
Harris, Elizabeth	William and Ann	6/6/1764
Harris, Esther	James and Mary	1/1/1763
Harris, Isaac	William and Ann	11/26/1779
Harris, James	William and Ann	11/15/1761
Harris, Jeane	William and Ann	2/5/1775
Harris, John	William and Ann	11/1/1781
Harris, Levin	William and Ann	2/21/1784
Harris, Lydia	James and Mary	2/6/1765
Harris, Lydia	William and Ann	1/4/1771
Harris, Mary	William and Ann	10/27/1756
Harris, Peter	James and Mary	4/5/1774
Harris, Rachael	William and Ann	3/27/1767
Harris, Rhoda	James and Mary	4/4/1772
Harris, Sarah	William and Ann	11/17/1758
Harris, Sarah	James and Mary	8/21/1767
Harris, William	William and Ann	5/29/1777
Holbrook, Alice	Alexander and Sarah	10/4/1761
Holbrook, Daniel	Alexander and Sarah	7/6/1770

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Holbrook, Frederick	Alexander and Sarah	3/27/1766
Holbrook, William	Alexander and Sarah	11/27/1763
Hubbert, Edward	Jesse and Priscilla	3/1/1773
Hubbert, Margaret	Jesse and Priscilla	6/6/1770
Hubbert, Niecee	Jesse and Priscilla	10/20/1776
Hubbert, Peter	Jesse and Priscilla	10/21/1778
Hubbert, Sarah	Jesss and Priscilla	2/16/1783
Hubbert, Tilghman	Jesss and Priscilla	7/21/1781
Jester, Jehu	Ebenezer and Sarah	4/20/1777
Jester, Joshua	Ebenezer and Sarah	1/18/1776
Jester, John	Ebenezer and Sarah	3/4/1780
Jester, Lydia	Ebenezer and Sarah	7/24/1782
Jester, Nathan	Ebenezer and Sarah	7/20/1784
Jenkins, Richard	Richard and Ann	4/4/1787
Jenkins, Sarah	Richard and Ann	3/3/1785
Jinkens, Mary	Richard and Ann	4/15/1784
Jinkens, Peter	Richard and Ann	5/28/1781
Kelley, Ann	William and Mary	3/22-1762
Kelley, Dennis	William and Mary	2/6/1764
Kelley, Elizabeth	William and Mary	8/21/1774
Kelley, Hix	William and Mary	6/14/1776
Kelley, John	William and Mary	9/12/1768
Kelley, Martin	William and Mary	5/11/1784
Kelley, Mary	William and Mary	11/14/1770
Kelley, Peter	William and Mary	6/1/1779
Kelley, William	William and Mary	1/20/1766
Kelley, William	Dennis and Ann	4/28/1791
Leverton, Charles	Moses and Rachel	2/12/1792
Leverton, Daniel	Moses and Ann	3/29/1770
Leverton, Elizabeth	Moses and Rachel	5/7/1794
Leverton, Isaac	Moses and Ann	2/7/1772
Leverton, Jacob	Moses and Ann	3/10/1774
Leverton, Jesse	Moses and Ann	1/24/1781
Leverton, John	Moses and Rachel	12/16/1787
Leverton, Lemuel	Moses and Rachel	2/5/1790
Leverton, Rachel	Moses and Rachel	11/2/1796
Leverton, Rhoda	Moses and Ann	2/9/1779
Leverton, Sarah	Moses and Rachel	1/25/1786
Linager, Elizabeth	Isaac and Rosanna	4/10/1771
Linager, James	Isaac and Rosanna	12/26/1773
Linager, Isaac	Elizabeth	4/10/1759
Linager, Mary	Isaac and Rosanna	10/1/1769
Man, Joseph	William and Elizabeth	5/17/1779
Mason, Lydia	Abraham and Sarah	6/16/1779
Mason, Mary	Abraham and Sarah	12/20/1782
Mason, Naomi	Abraham and Sarah	7/29/1770
Mason, Reubin	Abraham and Sarah	5/27/1773
Mason, Rhoda	Abraham and Sarah	8/6/1775
Mason, Sarah	Abraham and Sarah	11/21/1771
Morriston, Comfort	John and Comfort	5/6/1765
Morriston, Elizabeth	John and Comfort	10/20/1771
Morriston, George	John and Comfort	7/25/1763
Morriston, John	John and Comfort	7/1/1773
Morriston, Mary	John and Comfort	3/31/1758

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Morriston, Robinson	John and Comfort	6/25/1770
Morriston, Sarah	John and Comfort	10/28/1756
Morriston, Temperance	John and Comfort	7/25/1760
Nicols, Isaac	Joseph and Mary	1/22/1758
Nicols, Rachel	Joseph and Mary	9/5/1763
Nicols, Rhoda	Joseph and Mary	3/8/1756
Noble, Alexander	Joshua and Sarah	10/25/1812
Noble, Amelia	Joshua and Sarah	11/30/1816
Noble, Archabald	Joshua and Sarah	3/15/1803
Noble, Charles	Joshua and Sarah	8/12/1798
Noble, Daniel	Joshua and Sarah	12/26/1799
Noble, Elizabeth	Joshua and Sarah	2/8/1807
Noble, Esther	Joshua and Sarah	5/3/1809
Noble, James	Joshua and Sarah	4/30/1811
Noble, John	Joshua and Sarah	10/26/1801
Noble, Lovy	Joshua and Sarah	7/13/1805
Noble, Solomon	Joshua and Sarah	5/3/1809
Noble, Twyfords	Joshua and Sarah	5/25/1820
Noble, William	Joshua and Sarah	4/6/1815
Noble, William	Joshua and Sarah	10/24/1818
Poits, Isaac	William and Henrietta	5/4/1782
Poits, Sarah	William and Henrietta	11/28/1779
Poits, William	William and Henrietta	3/16/1781
Pool, Isaac	John and Anna	8/2/1779
Pool, John	John and Anna	7/22/1784
Pool, Levin	John and Anna	8/4/1776
Pool, Noddy	John and Anna	3/15/1782
Pool, Sarah	John and Anna	2/26/1778
Pool, William	John and Aney	8/31/1794
Russell, Ariminta	Elijah and Esther	2/14/1781
Russell, Nathan	Elijah and Esther	6/13/1778
Russell, Rachel	Elijah and Esther	2/16/1776
Richardson, Elizabeth	John and Elizabeth	2/18/1789
Richard, James	John and Elizabeth	2/28/1780
Richardson, John	John and Elizabeth	12/18/1773
Richardson, Joseph	John and Elizabeth	7/7/1784
Richardson, Mary	John and Elizabeth	11/17/1775
Richardson, Peter	John and Elizabeth	12/8/1777
Richardson, Sarah	John and Elizabeth	5/26/1782
Richardson, Solomon	John and Elizabeth	3/4/1772
Richardson, Thomas	John and Elizabeth	11/28/1791
Richardson, William	John and Elizabeth	6/9/1786
Smith, Ann	Joshua and Ann	11/31/1771
Smith, Caleb	Joshua and Ann	5/3/1780
Smith, Daniel	Joshua and Ann	3/22/1777
Smith, Joshua	Joshua and Ann	10/10/1769
Stanton, Anna	Beauchamp and Deborah	7/12/1799
Stanton, James	Thomas and Mary	7/14/1778
Stanton, Lydia	Beauchamp and Cloe	9/17/1788
Stanton, Mary	Thomas and Mary	10/19/1781
Stanton, Mary	Beauchamp and Deborah	3/28/1797
Stanton, Peter	Beauchamp and Deborah	8/30/1794
Stanton, Sarah	Beauchamp and Deborah	9/19/1792
Stevens, Ann	William and Mary	10/1/1765
Stevens, Daniel	Azel and Rebekah	2/5/1775

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Stevens, James	William and Mary	9/24/1770
Stevens, Jonathan	William and Mary	3/21/1768
Stevens, Mary	William and Mary	9/8/1775
Stevens, Rachael	William and Mary	2/18/1778
Stevens, Rhoda	William and Mary	7/4/1784
Stevens, Robinson	Azel and Rebekah	9/22/1773
Stevens, Sarah	William and Mary	4/5/1773
Stevens, William	Azel and Rebekah	2/13/1777
Swiggett, Adah	Johnson and Mary	5/8/1797
Swiggett, Esther	Johnson and Mary	4/11/1788
Swiggett, Henry	Johnson and Mary	3/11/1783
Swiggett, John	Johnson and Mary	9/17/1781
Swiggett, Levin	Henry and Sarah	8/11/1777
Swiggett, Mynta	Johnson and Mary	4/13/1790
Swiggett, Rhoda	Henry and Sarah	8/14/1775
Swiggett, Sarah	Johnson and Mary	9/24/1785
Swiggett, Solomon	Johnson and Mary	1/30/1794
Sulavane, Sarah	Daniel and Marget	1/7/1777
Sulivane, Daniel	Daniel and Margaret	11/11/1773
Sulivane, Joseph	Daniel and Margaret	1/13/1771
Sulivane, Mary	Daniel and Margaret	12/27/1775
Sulivane, Owen	Daniel and Margaret	3/4/1772
Sullivane, Isaac	Daniel and Margaret	10/29/1781
Sullivane, John	Daniel and Margaret	12/24/1783
Sullivan, Margaret	Daniel and Margaret	11/24/1779
Townsend, Celia	Benjamin and Elizabeth	5/13/1780
Townsend, Henry	Benjamin and Elizabeth	9/4/1775
Townsend, Sarah	Benjamin and Elizabeth	2/19/1778
Townsend, Thomas	Benjamin and Elizabeth	6/11/1772
Tumbleston, Henry	Ebenezar and Jane	9/25/1778
Tumbleston, Mary	Ebenezar and Jane	7/27/1776
Vichers, John	John and Mary	11/12/1770
Vichers, Joseph	John and Mary	4/12/1773
Vichers, Mary	John and Mary	10/14/1766
Vichers, Nathan	John and Mary	4/13/1768
Vichers, Richard	John and Mary	8/12/1775
Walker, James	John and Ariminta	8/4/1775
Walker, John	John and Ariminta	3/24/1779
Ward, Anne	Henry and Mary	7/11/1768
Ward, Daniel	Henry and Mary	4/19/1770
Ward, Esther	Henry and Mary	9/18/1788
Ward, Henry	Henry and Mary	7/20/1772
Ward, James	Henry and Mary	2/18/1774
Ward, Mary	Henry and Mary	6/8/1778
Ward, Rachel	Henry and Mary	11/6/1790
Ward, Richard	Henry and Mary	6/1/1776
Ward, Sarah	Henry and Mary	11/22/1781
Warren, Amos	William and Marget	4/3/1771
Warren, Baley	William and Marget	4/14/1773
Warren, Elizabeth	William and Marget	11/3/1765
Warren, John	William and Prisilla	1/5/1759
Warren, Johnson	William and Marget	9/26/1767
Warren, Lidy	William and Marget	2/21/1769
Warren, Lily	William and Marget	5/25/1777

Child	Parents	Date of Birth
Warren, Mary	William and Marget	2/20/1782
Warren, Rhoda	William and Margaret	11/2/1783
Warren, William	William and Marget	4/22/1776
Wheatley, Anthony	Anthony and Sophia	1/22/1791
Wheatley, Arthur	Anthony and Sophia	2/7/1794
Wheatley, Byng	William and Talitha	6/18/1781
Wheatley, Daniel	Anthony and Sophia	9/24/1788
Wheatley, Elizabeth	Anthony and Sophia	12/19/1784
Wheatley, Euphama	Anthony and Sophia	1/11/1786
Wheatley, Isaac	Anthony and Sophia	6/21/1797
Wheatley, William	Anthony and Sophia	5/3/1781
Williams, Bartholomew	John and Sarah	10/5/1767
Williams, John	John and Sarah	1/3/1774
Williams, Lavisa	John and Sarah	6/1/1765
Williams, Newell	John and Sarah	9/28/1776
Williams, Rachel	John and Sarah	10/17/1770
Willis, Andrew	Andrew and Sarah	11/3/1774
Willis, Anne	Thomas and Sina	12/5/1770
Willis, Elic	Thomas and Sinai	2/1/1785
Willis, Jesse	Thomas and Sina	2/15/1773
Willis, Joshua	Thomas and Sina	12/15/1774
Willis, Mary	Andrew and Sarah	12/5/1770
Willis, Milby	Thomas and Sina	8/7/1768
Willis, Milley	Thomas and Sinai	2/3/1784
Willis, Rhoda	Andrew and Sarah	5/18/1766
Willis, Roger	Andrew and Sarah	5/14/1768
Willis, Shadrick	Andrew and Sarah	5/15/1772
Willis, Thomas	Thomas and Sina	10/28/1776
Willis, William	Thomas and Sina	9/20/1771
Wilson, Ann	William and Hannah	2/11/1778
Wilson, Hannah	William and Hannah	12/7/1772
Wilson, James	William and Hannah	4/22/1770
Wilson, John	William and Hannah	5/1/1775
Wilson, Mary	William and Hannah	10/25/1768
Wilson, Rachel	William and Hannah	4/24/1782
Wilson, William	William and Hannah	2/25/1780
Wright, Ann	Lemuel and Elizabeth	1/22/1772
Wright, Charles	Willis and Sarah	8/18/1788
Wright, Daniel	Lemuel and Elizabeth	6/24/1764
Wright, Esther	Willis and Esther	12/14/1793
Wright, Hatfield	Roger and Mary	3/11/1769
Wright, Jacob	Lemuel and Elizabeth	9/22/1770
Wright, James	Roger and Mary	12/3/1760
Wright, James	John and Esther	9/5/1786
Wright, John	William and Sarah	3/9/1763
Wright, Leven	Roger and Mary	12/27/1757
Wright, Mary	Roger and Mary	5/31/1773
Wright, Peter	John and Esther	2/27/1791
Wright, Rachel	Lemuel and Elizabeth	10/2/1767
Wright, Sarah	Lemuel and Elizabeth	11/18/1762
Wright, Sarah	John and Esther	9/2/1785
Wright, Selah	Roger and Mary	5/17/1766
Wright, William	John and Esther	5/13/1788
Wright, Willis	John and Esther	5/13/1793

PART II
NICHOLITE MARRIAGES

PART II

NICHOLITE MARRIAGES

1. Thomas Willis and Siny Richets, both of Dorchester, 7/10/1767.
2. Moses Leverton and Nancy Adams, both of Dorchester, 5/29/1768.
3. Daniel Sullavane and Marget Melvin, both of Dorchester, 1/28/1770.
4. Elijah Russel and Esther Cranor, both of Caroline, 1/26/1775.
5. Isaac Charles and Nancy Payne, both of Dorchester, 9/21/1766.
6. Isaac Linager and Rosannah, of Dorchester, 4/16/1769.
7. Ezekiel Goslin and Peggy Bartlett, both of Dorchester, 11/23/1766.
8. Noble Covey, of Caroline, and Mary Bicham, of Kent (Delaware), 4/3/1775.
9. Edward Beck and Arimanti Wilson, both of Kent (Maryland), 7/1/1770.
10. Levin Wright and Mary Rumbly, both of Dorchester, 7/11/1773.
11. Solomon Charles and Sarah Addams, both of Dorchester, 5/23/1773.
12. William Charles and Leah Bartlet, both of Dorchester, 5/13/1770.
13. Solomon Bartlett, of Caroline, and Mary Victor, of Dorchester, 12/10/1775.
14. John Bachelor, of Talbot, and Eleanor Addams, of Dorchester, 4/5/1769.
15. Thomas Stanton and Mary Carter, both of Caroline, 12/2/1776.
16. John Dawson and Anne Harriss, both of Caroline, 1/5/1778.
17. James Wright and Sarah Harriss, both of Caroline, 7/6/1778.
18. Isaac Charles, of Dorchester, and Sophia Rauly, of Caroline, 1/2/1779.
19. Richard Jenkins and Ann Kelly, both of Caroline, 1/2/1779.
20. James Wright and Sarah Wright, both of Caroline, 3/4/1780.
21. Johnson Swigett and Mary Breeding, both of Caroline, 3/19/1780.
22. William Framton, of Caroline, and Marget Goslin, of Dorchester, 11/3/1781.
23. James Barton and Mary Ann Jenkins, both of Caroline, 4/6/1782.
24. Dennis Kelley and Sarah Jenkins, both of Caroline, 4/5/1783.
25. William Williams and Delilah Berry, both of Caroline, 3/31/1784.
26. John Wright and Esther Harriss, both of Caroline, 11/6/1784.
27. James Harriss, son of William, and Celia Wright, both of Caroline, 11/20/1784.
28. Moses Leverton and Rachel Wright, both of Caroline, 1/15/1785.
29. Elisha Dawson and Lydia Harriss, both of Caroline, 11/5/1785.
30. Daniel Wright and Sarah Harriss, both of Caroline, 12/3/1785.
31. William Poits, of Sussex (Delaware), and Adah Berry, of Caroline, 2/4/1786.
32. Williss Charles, of Dorchester, and Sarah Wright, of Caroline, 1/14/1786.
33. Edward Barton and Ann Harriss, both of Caroline, 12/2/1786.
34. James Wright, son of Levin, and Ann Ward, both of Caroline, 2/3/1787.
35. Beachamp Stanton and Chloe Chilcutt, both of Caroline, 11/3/1787.
36. William Bachelor and Elizabeth Jones, both of Caroline, 8/16/1788.
37. Solomon Wilson, Sr., and Rachel Saffard, both of Caroline, 11/13/1788.
38. Hubert Framptom and Mary Vickars, both of Dorchester, 10/18/1788.
39. Jacob Wright and Rhoda Harriss, both of Caroline, 12/5/1789.
40. Thomas Cane, Sr., of Kent (Delaware), and Frances Smith, of Caroline, 6/12/1790.
41. Thomas Grey, of Dorchester, and Sarah Marine, of Caroline, 1/14/1786.

42. Hatfield Wright, of Caroline, and Euphama Charles, of Dorchester, 10/16/1790.
43. Jonathan Twiford, of Sussex (Delaware), and Elizabeth Murphey, of Dorchester, 12/2/1790.
44. William Anderson, of Kent (Delaware), and Ann Causey, of Caroline, 8/31/1791.
45. Richard Vickars, of Dorchester, and Celia Chilcutt, of Caroline, 9/8/1791.
46. Beachamp Stanton, of Caroline, and Deborah Murpha, of Dorchester, 10/6/1791.
47. William Williss and Henney Chance, both of Caroline, 8/9/1792.
48. Owen Sullivane and Ester Stanton, both of Caroline, 12/26/1792.
49. Henry Charles and Mary Wright, both of Caroline, 1/17/1793..
50. James Wilson, of Caroline, and Sarah Charles, of Dorchester, 11/28/1793.
51. John Harvey and Catherine Framptom, both of Caroline, 11/5/1794.
52. John Pool and Aney Wallis, both of Dorchester, 10/30/1763.
53. Edward Hubbert and Ann Wright, both of Caroline, 12/6/1793.
54. Dennis Kelley and Hannah Wilson, both of Caroline, 12/18/1794.
55. John Pritchett and Sarah Jenkins, both of Caroline, 12/2/1797.
56. Levin Pool and Elizabeth Emmerson, both of Caroline, 1/18/1797.
57. Hatfield Wright and Lucrecia Lowe, both of Caroline, 10/13/1796.
58. Joshua Noble and Sarah Twifford, both of Sussex (Delaware), date omitted.
59. John Moriston and Catharine Harvy, both of Caroline, 9/16/1798.
60. Owen Sulavane and Elizabeth Fidamon, both of Caroline, 12/10/1800.
61. Henry Ward and Mary Cooper, 9/1/1767 (No witnesses listed in the volume which contains copies of the Nicholite marriage certificates).

In the above marriage records the county (and state, in the case of those who lived in Delaware) where each person resided is listed. Those counties which are not followed by the name of a state are all in Maryland. In several of these certificates the name of the father of a person is listed — apparently to distinguish the man from someone else of the same name. In the others there is no mention of the parents of the parties involved although, in many of them, the parents signed as witnesses.

PART III

WITNESSES TO NICHOLITE MARRIAGES

PART III

WITNESSES TO NICHOLITE MARRIAGES

The numbers in parentheses, after each of the following names, refer to the number which has been given to each marriage in Part II.

Adams, Elijah	(50)
Addams, Thomas	(5)
Alcock, John	(7)
Anderson, Ann	(22, 23)
Anderson, Celia	(57)
Anderson, Ezekiel	(44)
Anderson, James	(2, 6, 7, 18, 20, 44, 55, 56, 57)
Anderson, James II	(29)
Anderson, Major	(44)
Andrew, Celia	(51)
Andrew, Elisha	(41)
Andrew, Richard	(18)
Anthony, Ann	(56)
Anthony, Joseph	(56)
Bartlett, Daniel	(47, 54)
Bartlett, James	(47)
Bartlett, Solomon	(12, 38)
Barton, Edward	(24, 25, 26, 31, 34, 48, 51, 55)
Barton, Eliza	(33)
Barton, James	(33)
Barton, John	(3, 4, 10, 15, 16, 21)
Barton, William	(16, 21, 26, 33)
Bachelor, Esther	(36)
Bachelor, Nathan	(36)
Bachelor, Nealy (Nelly?)	(36)
Batchelder, John	(2, 11)
Batchelder, William	(8)
Beachamp, Andrew	(51)
Beachamp, Curtis	(46, 48, 51)
Beachamp, Sophia	(51)
Beck, Edward	(10)
Berry, Adah	(25)
Berry, Delilah	(21)
Berry, Littleton	(15, 21)
Berry, Naomi	(25, 31)
Berry, William	(4, 8, 10, 25, 31)
Bishop, Robert	(4, 34)
Boon, James	(35, 40, 45)
Boon, Mary	(37, 40, 45)
Branghon, Sophia	(5)
Breeding, John	(21)
Bright, Solomon	(38)
Buchingham, Levi	(22, 23)
Cain, Thomas	(6)
Cannon, Tubman	(45)
Caldwell, James, Jr.	(12)
Calaway, Joseph	(6)
Carroll, John	(27)

Causey, Robert	(53)
Chance, Aaron	(47)
Chance, Bachelor	(40)
Chance, Eliza	(40)
Chance, Esther	(57)
Chance, Rich	(47)
Chance, Tilghman	(40, 47, 59)
Charles, Elijah	(12, 38, 42, 43, 49, 50, 56, 57)
Charles, Euphama	(32, 39, 49)
Charles, Henry	(32, 36, 39, 42, 43, 46, 50, 57, 58)
Charles, Isaac	(1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 46, 50, 53, 60)
Charles, Jacob	(32, 38, 42, 49, 50, 57)
Charles, Jacob, Jr.	(42, 50, 57)
Charles, Levin	(12)
Charles, Mary	(1, 50, 57)
Charles, Nancy	(7)
Charles, Sarah	(10, 42, 43, 49)
Charles, Solomon	(14)
Charles, Willis	(24, 26, 27, 33, 42, 49, 50, 56)
Charles, William	(13, 14)
Chilcutt, Celia	(35, 37, 40)
Chilcutt, Esther	(45)
Chilcutt, Joshua	(10, 35, 37, 40, 45, 47)
Chilcutt, Pheobe	(45)
Chilcutt, Rhoda	(35, 37, 40, 45, 47)
Chipman, Benjamin	(6)
Chipman, Peris	(7)
Clark, James	(7, 14)
Clampit, Henry	(6)
Claypool, James	(2)
Collins, Nicey	(53)
Collins, Sarah	(55)
Connalley, Jeremiah	(12)
Cook, Thomas	(2, 3)
Cooper, Risdon	(41)
Covey, Mary	(15)
Covey, Noble	(4, 15, 16, 24)
Covey, Rhoda	(8, 13)
Craner, Joshua	(4, 8, 60)
Cranor, Solomon	(28)
Cromeen (Cremeen), Elijah	(1, 19, 35, 59)
Davis, Solomon	(6)
Davis, Aquila	(18)
Dawson, Anne	(29, 30)
Dawson, Daniel	(34)
Dawson, Edward	(29)
Dawson, Elijah	(29, 30)
Dawson, Elisabeth	(16)
Dawson, Elisha	(30, 39, 56)
Dawson, Isabel	(16)
Dawson, John	(29, 30, 39, 48, 55)
Dawson, Jonas	(29)
Dawson, Lydia	(30)
Dawson, Margaret	(29, 30)
Dawson, Phoebe	(30)

Dawson, William	(3, 16, 19, 29)
Dawson, William, Jr.	(16)
Deane, Joshua	(52)
Dobson, William	(41)
Eccles (Acles), Richard	(20, 24)
Eccles, Sarah	(15)
Edmondson, John, Jr.	(5)
Edmondson, Mary	(5)
Emmerson, Samuel	(56, 59)
Emmerson, Samuel, Jr.	(56)
Evitts, Seth Hill	(24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34, 44, 51, 54, 55, 56)
Fidamun, Hawkins	(60)
Flower, John	(5)
Foster, Joseph	(4, 8, 15)
Foster, Rebecca	(22, 23)
Foster, Thomas	(4, 15)
Foxwell, Richard	(57)
Frampton, Anna	(51)
Frampton, Hubert (Hubird)	(28, 33, 36, 43, 45, 46)
Frampton, John	(22, 23)
Frampton, Levi	(32, 34, 36, 38, 42, 46, 49, 58)
Frampton, Richard	(19, 22, 23)
Frampton, Sarah	(22, 23)
Frampton, Thomas	(38)
Frampton, William	(38)
Godwin, Henry	(39, 53)
Goforth, Zachariah	(6)
Goslin, Ezekiel	(12)
Goslin(g), Peggy (Marget)	(2, 13)
Goslin, Waitman	(44)
Gray, Thomas	(17)
Grey, Levin	(41)
Grey, Matthew	(41)
Hall, James	(59)
Harper, Beachamp	(7, 12)
Harris, Ann	(17, 27, 31)
Harris, Celia	(29, 32, 42, 44)
Harris, Esther	(16, 25)
Harris, James	(2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 44, 52)
Harris, James, Jr.	(21, 26, 29, 33)
Harris, Lydia	(25, 44)
Harris, Mary	(10, 13)
Harris, Peter	(30, 39, 53)
Harris, Rachel	(25, 27)
Harris, Rhoda	(30, 34)
Harris, Sarah	(16, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29)
Harris, William	(3, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)
Harvey, Mary	(25)
Harvey, Samuel	(51)
Hilford David	(1, 6, 7)
Hilford, Sarah	(6)
Holdbrook, Alexander	(3, 4, 9, 17, 18, 21)
Holland (Hollon), Laban	(7, 12, 14, 52)
Horney, James	(8, 9, 15, 16, 52)

Horney, John	(9)
Horney, Philip	(4)
Horney, William	(2, 52)
Hubbert, Edward	(44)
Hubbert, Margaret	(25)
Hubbert, Peter	(53)
Jenkins, James	(55)
Jenkins, Henry	(53, 55)
Jenkins, Hessey	(55)
Jenkins, Mary	(19)
Jenkins, Richard	(18, 22, 23, 26)
Jenkins, Sarah	(19)
Jenkins, Thomas	(9, 19, 24, 44)
Johnson, Cornelius	(21, 52)
Johnson, Lemon	(37, 45)
Jones, John	(12)
Kelly, Denis	(19, 48)
Kelley, Eliza	(25)
Kelley, Hix	(54)
Kelley, William	(19, 22, 23, 24, 29)
Kenton, Solomon	(47, 54)
Kimmey, James	(52)
Leverton, Daniel	(32, 33, 39, 42, 46, 49)
Leverton, Isaac	(42, 43, 49)
Leverton, Moses	(1, 5, 11, 12, 25, 30, 36, 46, 53, 57, 58)
Leverton, Rachel	(30, 36, 53)
Linagaer (Linager), Isaac	(2, 52, 53)
Love, Ann	(40)
Mackimmy (Mackimy), Elijah	(9, 13)
Man, Joseph	(30)
Martino, John	(2)
Marine, Mary	(11)
Marine, Sarah	(20)
Marine (Marain), Zorobabel	(2, 59)
Mason, Abraham	(1, 9)
McKimmey, Esther	(48)
McKimmey, John	(48)
Melvin, Edmond	(6)
Melvin, John	(1, 6)
Melvin, Mary	(14)
Miner, Edward	(14, 52)
Morgan, William	(16)
Morriston, Cathren	(60)
Morriston, John	(3, 4, 9, 13, 15, 17, 21, 48, 60)
Murphey (Murpha), Ann	(46)
Murphey, Deborah	(43)
Murphy (Murpha), James	(22, 23, 43, 46)
Murphey, William Banning	(43, 55)
Nauler (Naula), Joseph	(26, 29, 33)
Nicolls, Joseph	(5)
Nicolls, Isaac	(4)
Noble, Joshua	(56)
Noble, Mark	(58)
Noble, Rhoda	(18)
Noble, Tansey	(18)

Payne, David	(5)
Pegg, Martin	(5, 7, 20)
Pegg, Valentine	(1, 3)
Perry, Mary	(51)
Peters, William	(24)
Poits, William	(51, 55)
Pool, John	(11, 12, 22, 23, 46, 53, 57, 58)
Pool, Isaac	(56)
Pool, Levin	(46, 49, 53, 57, 58)
Pool, Sarah	(56)
Prichett, John	(48, 59)
Prichett, Sarah	(59)
Prichett, Wingate	(55)
Pruets, Southy	(59)
Richardson, John, Jr.	(15, 24)
Richardson, Mary	(19)
Robinson, Samuel	(6)
Roe, Mary	(45)
Ross, Archibald	(55)
Ross, John	(2)
Rumbly, Elisabeth	(10)
Russel, Elijah	(8, 60)
Russel, Easter	(60)
Shanahan, Deborah	(45)
Sharp, Isaac	(34)
Smith, Joshua	(3, 9, 20, 24, 44)
Smith, Levin	(40)
Smith, Mary	(40)
Smith, Matthew	(40)
Stack, Rachel	(48)
Stack, Thomas	(22, 23)
Stafford, James	(21)
Stafford, Jarvis	(12)
Standley, Joseph	(5, 6)
Stanford, Richard	(5)
Stanton, Beacham(p)	(31, 34, 45, 48)
Stanton, Deborah	(48, 51)
Stanton, Esther	(35)
Stanton, John	(16)
Stanton, Sarah	(25, 31, 35)
Stanton, Thomas	(1, 35, 46, 52)
Stuard, Charles	(14)
Stevens, James	(48)
Stevens, Robinson	(48)
Stevens, William	(18, 30)
Sulevane, Owen	(10, 15)
Sulivane, David	(2, 5, 8, 13, 14)
Sulivane, John	(5, 41, 48, 60)
Sulivane, Sarah	(13)
Sullavin, Florence	(1, 5)
Sullivane, Levin	(48)
Sullivane, Mary	(32, 41)
Swiget, Johnson	(19, 22, 23, 24)
Swigett, Mary	(20)
Swigett, William	(21)

Swiggate, Rhoda	(45)
Swiggins, Lydia	(54)
Tod(d), Benjamin	(51)
Tull, Esther	(5, 7)
Tull, Richard	(2, 52)
Tumblin, Covil	(1)
Twiford, Archibald L.	(58)
Twiford, Solomon	(43, 58, 59)
Twiford, Zorobabe Smith	(58)
Twyford, Elizabeth	(46, 58, 59)
Twyford, Johnathan	(46, 57, 58, 59)
Vickars, Celia	(46)
Vickars, John	(38, 45)
Vickars, Joseph	(45)
Vickars, Richard	(36, 38, 39, 46, 49)
Walker, John	(18, 21, 31, 34)
Ward, Daniel	(34, 37, 50)
Ward, Henry	(34, 35, 37, 47)
Ward, James	(54)
Ward, Mary	(37)
Warren, William	(1, 2)
Watkins, Thomas	(1, 10, 11, 36)
Webb, James	(1)
White, Joshua	(2)
Williams, Delila	(59)
Williams, Eleanor	(53)
Williams, William	(31, 59)
Willis, Andrew	(9, 14, 15, 19, 25)
Willis, Ann	(47)
Willis, Jesse	(47)
Willis, Mary	(14)
Willis, Milley	(47)
Willis, Sina(i)	(22, 23, 47)
Willis, Thomas	(2, 4, 8, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19)
Willis, William	(38, 42)
Wilson, Ann	(54)
Wilson, Catharine	(54)
Wilson, Elizabeth	(54)
Wilson, Hannah	(37, 50)
Wilson, James	(37, 40, 45, 47)
Wilson, John	(50, 54)
Wilson, Rachel	(40)
Wilson, Mary	(50)
Wilson, Rebecca	(40, 54)
Wilson, Sarah	(54)
Wilson, Solomon	(37, 40, 47, 54)
Wilson (Willson), William	(35, 37, 47, 54)
Worrilaw(?), John	(2)
Wright, Ann	(13, 39)
Wright, Anna	(30, 39)
Wright, Celia	(26, 28)
Wright, Daniel	(28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 39, 41, 42, 49, 53, 58)
Wright, Edward	(11)
Wright, Elisha	(26)
Wright, Esther	(27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 49)

Wright, Euphama	(43)
Wright, Hatfield	(26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 38, 39, 41, 43, 46, 49, 50, 58)
Wright, Jacob	(28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 46, 53)
Wright, James	(12, 20, 27, 30, 33, 38, 41, 53)
Wright, John	(2, 5, 11, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 48, 55, 56)
Wright, Lemuel	(1, 2, 3, 12, 17, 20, 26, 28, 30, 39)
Wright, Levin	(1, 3, 5, 11, 13, 17, 20, 27, 32, 33, 39, 41, 42)
Wright, Levin, Jr.	(11, 20)
Wright, Levina	(20)
Wright, Lovey	(11)
Wright, Mary	(27, 32, 42, 43)
Wright, Peter	(34, 53)
Wright, Rhoda	(49)
Wright, Roger	(10, 11, 20, 26, 27, 28, 32, 42, 52)
Wright, Sarah	(17, 26, 27, 28, 30, 53)
Wright, William	(5, 7)

PART IV
NICHOLITES ADMITTED INTO THE
SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

PART IV

NICHOLITES ADMITTED INTO THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

A. By Third Haven Monthly Meeting

Name and Date Admitted

1/11/1798	William Poits Adah Poits Anthony Wheatley Sophia Wheatley William Gray Elizabeth Gray Jesse Hubbart Sarah Pool Sarah Poits Ann Gray Lovey Gray John Barton William Peters William Wilson James Wilson Rebecca Wilson James Wilson, Jr. Sarah Wilson Solomon Kenton James Boon Sarah Boon
James Harris Mary Harris Peter Harris Mary Stevens Johnson Swigget Mary Swigget John Wright Hester Wright Williss Charles Sarah Charles Elisha Dawson Lydia Dawson Elizabeth Wright Mary Wright Jacob Wright Rhoda Wright Daniel Wright Sarah Wright Richard Foxwell James Wright Sarah Wright Hatfield Wright Lucretia Wright Mary Richardson Margaret Connely John Pool Ann Pool Levin Pool Elizabeth Pool Moses Leverton Rachel Leverton James Murphey Mary Murphey William Murphey Ruth Murphey Elizabeth Frampton Euphama Charles Elijah Charles William Frampton Margaret Frampton Elizabeth Twiford William Melona Sophia Melona George Hardy Fisher Daniel Fisher Thomas Gray Sarah Gray	2/15/1798 James Anderson Celia Anderson John Berry Ann Emmerson Dennis Kelly Hannah Kelly Mary Ann Barton Esther Chance Elizabeth Kenton Jonathan Shannahan Margaret Shannahan 3/15/1798 Ann Love John Wilson Ann Wilson 5/17/1798 John Dawson Ann Dawson Elijah Russel Esther Russel Sarah Swiggett Richard Vichers Celia Vichers Catharine Harvey Henry Charles Mary Charles

Name and Date Admitted

Elijah Bartlett	Anna Barton
Esther Bartlett	Elizabeth Barton
Celia Bartlett	Nathan Harris
Sarah Vichers	William Harris
Jesse Leverton	James Barton
Clement Melona	Peter Barton
William Melona, Jr.	Rhoda Barton
Comfort Melona	William Barton
Elizabeth Melona	James Barton
Joshua Crainer	Elizabeth Barton
Perry Gray	Celia Wright
Joseph Gray	Ann Wright
Esther Gray	Harris Wright
William Wheatley	Samuel Wright
Bing Wheatley	Lydia Wright
Elizabeth Wheatley	Nathan Wright
Euphamy Wheatley	Levisa Wright
William Wilson, Jr.	Millah Wright
Rachel Wilson	Elisha Wright
7/12/1798	Aaron Wright
Solomon Lenton, Jr.	Sarah Wright
8/16/1798	Ann Melony
Archabald Ross	James Melony
Elizabeth Ross	Tilghman Melony
Joseph Anthony	Priscilla Melony
Ann Anthony	Mary Melony
Esther Chilcutt	Joshua Vickers
Mary Perry	William Vickers
11/15/1798	John Vickers
Jacob Wilson	Sarah Leverton
Nathan Wilson	John Leverton
John Pool	Samuel Leverton
Daniel Pool	Charles Leverton
William Pool	Elizabeth Leverton
1/17/1799	Rebecca Leverton
Jacob Leverton	Mary Leverton
Daniel Wheatley	5/16/1799
Arthur Wheatley	Tilghman Wright
Anthony Wheatley	Roger Wright
Isaac Wheatley	Celia Wright
2/14/1799	Isaac Frampton
Eli Anderson	John Melona
Joseph Man	Eleanor Melona
Elizabeth Gray	Rachel Fisher
William Gray	Sarah Fisher
Lydia Gray	George Fisher
Sarah Gray	Alexander Fisher
4/11/1799	John Swiggett
Jacob Charles	Henry Swiggett
Lydia Barton	Sarah Swiggett
Andrew Barton	Esther Swiggett
Levin Barton	

Name and Date Admitted

Mynter Swiggett	Sarah Barton
Solomon Swiggett	Ann Barton
Adar Swiggett	6/13/1799
James Wright	William Poits
William Wright	Isaac Poits
Peter Wright	7/11/1799
Willis Wright	Deborah Shannahan
Rhoda Wright	Elizabeth Shannahan
Mary Wright	8/15/1799
Daniel Dawson	Isaac Pool
Deborah Dawson	Rhoda Pool
William Dawson	Sarah Poits
Mary Kelley	Mary Ross
William Kelley	Elizabeth Man
Anna Kelley	William Berry
Hicks Kelley	Naomi Berry
William Ross	John Pritchett
Noah Ross	Sarah Pritchett
Mary Anderson	11/14/1799
Lydia Anderson	James Ward
Wright Anderson	4/17/1800
Jesse Hubbard	Mary Berry
John Hubbard	Elizabeth Wilson
Wright Charles	Rebecca Wilson
Esther Charles	Mary Wilson
Lydia Dawson	Lucretia Ward

B. By Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting

8/13/1800	Adams Foxwell
William Williams	George Foxwell
Delilah Williams	11/11/1801
Celia Williams	Seth Hill Evitts
John Vickars	6/15/1803
Pheba Vickars	Margaret Emerson
Southy Pruitt	1/16/1805
Thomas Tilor	Elijah Cromeane
9/10/1800	6/12/1805
James Wright	Beachump Stanton
Ann Wright	9/11/1805
11/12/1800	Sarah Stanton
Edward Hubbert	Peter Stanton
12/10/1800	Mary Stanton
John Vickars	Anna Stanton
1/14/1801	James Stanton
Daniel Wright	Elizabeth Stanton
3/11/1801	Thomas Stanton
William James Wright	10/16/1805
Elizabeth Gray	Amilla Chance
4/14/1801	3/12/1806
Hubert Frampton	Elender Kelley
6/10/1801	8/13/1806
Johnsua Williams	Perry Kelley

Name and Date Admitted

William Williams	Jonah Kelley
Mary Williams	Mary Kelley
Sarah Williams	Elender Kelley
Adah Williams	2/10/1819
7/15/1801	*Elizabeth Twiford
Ann Foxwell	Jonathan Twiford
Daniel Foxwell	

*Elizabeth Twiford first applied for membership in 1797 and was received on 1/11/1798. Shortly thereafter she asked to be released from Friends' membership. It was not until 1819 that she, accompanied this time by her husband, asked for membership once more.

PART V
NICHOLITE WILLS

PART V

NICHOLITE WILLS

	A. Caroline County
WILLIAM HARRIS	12th of 3rd month, 1784 June 15, 1784 Wife: Ann; sons: James (eldest), William, Isaac, John, Levin; daughters: Mary, Elizabeth, Rachel, Lydia, and Jane. Witnesses: James Harris, Joshua Smith, and Joshua Cranor. JR#B, pp. 3-7.
LEVIN WRIGHT	12th of 10th month, 1785 October 21, 1785 Wife: Mary; sons: James, Peter, Levin, and Charles; daughter: Ann (wife of Shadrach Willis). Witnesses: James Harris, Daniel Wright, and Lemuel Wright. JR#B, pp. 41-43.
WILLIAM KELLEY	November 22, 1785 March 1, 1787 Wife: Mary; sons: William, John, Hicks, Peter, Martin, and Dennis; daughters: Ann Jenkins, Mary, Elizabeth, and Leah. Witnesses: Andrew Beachamp, William Gray, and Stephen Flehardt. JR#B, pp. 77-79.
WILLIAM STEVENS	19th of 5th month, 1790 September 20, 1790 Wife: Mary; sons: Jonathan (elder), and James; daughters: Sarah, Mary, Rhoda, and Rachel. Four friends to value estate: Seth Hill Evitts, Jesse Hubbert, Edward Barton, and James Harris. Witnesses: Edward Barton, Jesse Hubbert, and Seth Hill Evitts. JR#B, pp. 167-168.
THOMAS WILLIS	22nd of 8th month, 1792 November 27, 1792 Wife: Sinai; sons: Milbey, Jesse, Joshua, Thomas, and Elic; daughter: Milley. Witnesses: James Harris, Seth Hill Evitts, and Thomas Stanton. JR#B, pp. 203-209.
ROGER WRIGHT	15th of 7th month, 1792 December 19, 1792 Sons: James, Hatfield, and Levin (a Quaker); daughter: Mary. Trustees: Moses Leverton and Lemuel Wright. Witnesses: Daniel Leverton, Robert Hall, and James Murphrey. JR#B, pp. 211-212.
THOMAS STANTON	14th of 11th month, 1793 December 3, 1793 Sons: Beacham, James, and John; daughters: Dorothy Blades and Mary Stanton; granddaughter: Elizabeth Blades. Trustees: Henry Ward and James Harris. Witnesses: John Morriston, Jr., and John Harvey, Sr. JR#B, pp. 229-231.
JOSHUA CHILCUTT	22nd of 12 month, 1792 June 3, 1794 Wife: Esther; sons: Peter and John; daughters: Rhoda, Esther, Febe, Anne, Mary Boon, and Celia Vickers. Witnesses: William Warren, Thomas Williams, Daniel Leverton. JR#B, pp. 239-240.
NEHEMIAH SAULSBURY	4th of 9th month, 1794 September 30, 1794 Wife: Deborah; sons: Charles, Noah, and Wilson. Executor: Seth Hill Evitts. Witnesses: Lydia Wilson, Prudence Willoughby, and Daniel Saulsbury. JR#B, pp. 245-246.

JAMES HORNEY	14th of 8th month, 1794 December 11, 1794
Relatives (all children of Jeffry Horney): William, John, and Philip, Horney, Elizabeth Anderson, Deborah Stanley, Lydia Saulsbury, and Ann Dial. Friend: James Harris. Executors: James Harris and Seth Hill Evitts. Witnesses: Charles Jones, Solomon Hobbs, and Comfort Hobbs. JR#B, pp. 252-254.	
HENRY WARD	15th of 10th month, 1794 April 7, 1795
Wife: Mary; sons: Daniel, Henry, Richard, and James; daughters: Ann Wright, Mary, Lydia, and Rachel. Witnesses: James Harris, James Wilson, and William Wilson. JR#B, pp. 271-274.	
JONATHAN WILSON	4th of 2nd month, 1795 September 22, 1795
Wife: Lydia; sons: Jonathan, John, Joshua, Daniel, Peter, and William; daughters: Levina and Rebecca; grandsons (sons of Jonathan): William and John. Witnesses: Seth Hill Evitts, William Mobray, James Smith, and Mary Waddel. JR#B, pp. 288-292.	
WILLIAM DAWSON	27th of 5th month, 1795 December 7, 1795
Wife: Isabelle; sons: John, Elijah, Elisha, Shadrach, William Frederick, Joseph, and Jonas; daughters: Elizabeth, Margaret; granddaughter: Isabel (d. of Shadrach); grandson: William (of Joseph). Witnesses: James Harris, Owen Sulivane, and William Poits, JR#B pp. 301-304.	
SOLOMON WILSON	31st of 3rd month, 1795 May 10, 1795
Wife: Rachel; sons: Solomon, Elisha, and George; daughters: Rebeckah and Mary; brother: James. Witnesses: James Harris, Solomon Kenton, and James Wilson, Jr. JR#B, pp. 341-342.	
LEMUEL WRIGHT	6th of 12th month, 1794 September 27, 1796
Wife: Elizabeth; sons: Daniel and Jacob; daughters: Sarah, Rachel Leverton, Ann Hubbert, and Mary Wright. Trustees: William Peters, Seth Hill Evitts, James Harris, and Levin Wright (of Roger). Witnesses: John Wright, Elisha Dawson, and John Pool. JR#B, pp. 351-353.	
JOHN HARVEY	17th of 4th month, 1795 April 25, 1795
Wife: Cathrane; sons: Samuel and Beacham; daughter Sophia. Witnesses: William Andrew and Andrew Beachamp. JR#B, pp. 359-361.	
HENRY SWIGGETT	23rd of 9th month, 1798 November 27th, 1798
Wife: Sarah; sons: William, Johnson, Harmon, Henry, Levin, Daniel, and James; daughters: Rhoda Swiggett and Sarah Coldscott. Trustees: Peter Harris, Willis Charles, James Anderson, and Edward Barton. Witnesses: James Harris, William Jones, and Hannah Jones. JR#B, pp. 429-432.	
JAMES HARRIS	2nd of 8th month, 1799 October 15, 1799
Wife: Mary; son: Peter; daughters: Anne Dawson, Lydia Dawson, Esther Wright, Sarah Wright, Rhoda Wright. Witnesses: Seth Hill Evitts, William Peters, and Edward Barton. JR#B, pp. 459-460. B. Kent County, Delaware	
JOSEPH NICOLLS (Nichols)	January 23, 1770 December 31, 1770

Wife: Mary; children: unnamed. Witnesses: Covil Tumlin, James Anderson, David Hillford. p. 255.

BENJAMIN CHIPMAN April 19, 1772
June 23, 1772

Wife: Mary; daughter: Susanna; sons: Stephen and Benjamin. Witnesses: Patrick Crain, Peres Chipman, and Reuben Sheild. p. 267.

DAVID HILLFORD (Yeoman) Dec. 1774
Administration papers to widow: Sarah. p. 294.

ZACHARIAH GOFOORTH (Yeoman) Augt

ZACHARIAH GOFORTH (Yeoman) August 9, 1764
Wife: Sarah; nephew: Peter Goforth (son of brother Thomas) August 29, 1779

wife: Sarah; nephew: Peter Gororth (son of brother Thomas). Executors: Sarah Gorforth and Jonathan Emerson. Witnesses: Alexander Whiteley, Uriah Sipple, Mary Jenkins. p. 322.

RICHARD ECKELS (Eccles) April 20, 1783
May 14, 1733

Wife: Ann; sons: John, Anthoney, Richard, and Jesse; daughters: Esther, Julana, Lydia, Hannah, Sarah Jester and Mary Jester. Witnesses: Frances Jester, Major Anderson, Phillis Jester. p. 350.

SARAH GOFORTH June 7, 1785
December 16, 1785

Heirs: Peter Goforth, son of Thomas; Sarah, Zachariah and Jonathan Murphey, children of Charles Murphey; Mary Murphey, wife of Charles; Elizabeth Sheridine; Zachariah and Sarah Goforth, children of George; William Redin and Charles Redin; Thomas, William, and Rachel Glanding; Nancy Ricketts, wife of Thomas; Charles Murphey. Witnesses: William Richardson, Samuel Clampett, and Tabithy Wilson. p. 376.

JAMES ANDERSON February 9, 1791
March 7, 1791

Wife: Ann; sons: John, James, Isaac, Daniel, Elijah, Major, and Eli; daughter: Ann Callay. Witnesses: Abraham Kimme, Unisey Cain, and Ezekiel Anderson. p. 441.

ANN ECKELS (widow of Richard) April 18, 1796

ANN ECKELS (widow of Richard) April 10, 1756
Administration papers to Anthony Eckels (Eccles). Heirs: Jesse, Julana,
Lydia, John, Richard, and Anthony Eckles, Sarah Jester, Mary Jester,
Anny Taylor, and Esther Taylor. p. 506.

RICHARD ECKLES March 17, 1796
April 18, 1796

April 16, 1796

The above probate records (wills and administration accounts) are taken from *Calendar of Kent County, Delaware, Probate Records, 1680-1800* (Dover, 1944).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

A. Manuscripts

- Birth Records of the Nicholites. One volume. With the records of Third Haven Monthly Meeting of Friends, on deposit at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.
- Deeds of Dorchester County, Maryland. Liber Old 22. Found in the office of the Clerk of the Court, Dorchester County Court House, Cambridge, Maryland.
- Deeds of Kent County, Delaware. Liber R. Found in the Kent County Court House, Dover, Delaware.
- Marriage Records of the Nicholites. One volume. Located with the records of Third Haven Monthly Meeting of Friends, on deposit at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.
- Minutes of Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting of Friends. With the records of Third Haven Monthly Meeting of Friends, on deposit at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.
- Minutes of Southern Quarterly Meeting for Men. On deposit at Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College Library, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. Volume I (1759-1822).
- Minutes of Southern Quarterly Meeting for Women. On deposit at Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College Library, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. Volume I (1756-1816).
- Minutes of Third Haven Monthly Meeting of Friends. On deposit at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland. Volumes III (1747-1797) and IV (1797-1871).
- Nicholite Petition to the General Assembly of North Carolina. Located at the State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Nicholite Queries. Found in a letter from Anthony Whately to Benjamin Ferris, now found in the Ferris Collection, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.
- Wills of Caroline County, Maryland. Liber JR#B. On deposit at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.
- Wills of Kent County, Delaware. Liber L. Found in the Kent County Court House, Dover, Delaware.

B. Books

- Asbury, Francis. Edited by Elmer T. Clark, J. Manning Potts, and Jacob S. Payton. *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*. Nashville, 1958. Volume I.
- Bangs, Nathan. *The Life of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson: Compiled from His Printed and Manuscript Journals, and Other Authentic Documents*. New York, 1838.
- Calendar of Kent County, Delaware, Probate Records, 1680-1800. Compiled by Leon deValinger, Jr. Dover, 1944.
- Comly, John and Comly, Isaac (ed.). *Friends Miscellany: Being a Collection of Essays and Fragments, Biographical, Religious, Epistolary, Narrative, and Historical; etc.* Philadelphia, 1833. Volume IV.
- Fries, Adelaide L. (ed.) *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*. Raleigh, 1926. Volume III.
- Grellet, Stephen. Edited by Benjamin Seebohn. *Memoirs of the Life and Gospel Labours of Stephen Grellet*. Philadelphia, 1860.

- Hicks, Elias. *Journal of the Life and Religious Labours of Elias Hicks*, New York, 1832.
- Hinshaw, William W. *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy*. Ann Arbor, 1936-1950. Volume I.
- Jordan, Richard. *A Journal of the Life and Religious Labours of Richard Jordan, a Minister of the Gospel in the Society of Friends, Late of Newton, in Gloucester County, New Jersey*. Philadelphia, 1829.
- Laws of Maryland Made Since M, DCC, LXIII, Consisting of Acts of Assembly Under the Proprietary Government, Etc. Annapolis, 1787.
- Martin, Isaac. *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Labours, and Religious Exercises of Isaac Martin, Late of Rahway, in East Jersey, Deceased*. Philadelphia, 1834.
- Memorials Concerning Deceased Friends: Being a Selection from the Records of the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania, Etc., from the Year 1788 to 1878 Inclusive.** Philadelphia, 1879.
- Routh, Martha. *Memoir of the Life, Travels, and Religious Experiences of Martha Routh, Written by Herself or Compiled from Her Own Narrative*. New York, 1832.
- Woolman, John. Edited by Amelia Mott Gummere. *The Journal and Essays of John Woolman*. Philadelphia, 1922.

C. Articles

- Mifflin, Benjamin. "A Journal of a Journey from Philada. [sic] to the Cedar Swamps and Back, 1764." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. LII (1928), 130-140. [pp. 131-132 contain the earliest contemporary reference to Joseph Nichols — 1764. Mifflin tells of a crowd going to hear Joseph Nichols who was to have a public disputation with Parson Ingles of Dover, Delaware; Mifflin also gives a vigorous and violent criticism of Joseph Nichols.]

II. SECONDARY WORKS

A. Books

- Anscombe, Francis Charles. *I Have Called You Friends: The Story of Quakerism in North Carolina*. Boston, 1959.
- Bowden, The *History of the Society of Friends in America*. London, 1854. Volume II.
- Drake, Thomas E. *Quakers and Slavery in America*. New Haven, 1950.
- Forbush, Bliss. *Elias Hicks, Quaker Liberal*. New York, 1956.
- Janney, Samuel M. *History of the Religious Society of Friends, from Its Rise to the Year 1828*. Philadelphia, 1833. Volume III.
- Jones, Elias. *Revised History of Dorchester County, Maryland*. Baltimore, 1925. [pp. 415-425 contain an account of the Marine family.]
- Michener, Ezra. *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism: Being Extracts from the Records of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and the Meetings Composing It, to Which Is Prefixed an Account of Their First Establishment*. Philadelphia, 1860.
- Rhodes, Nelson Osgood (ed.). *Colonial Families of the United States*. Baltimore, 1920. Volume VII. [pp. 349-356 contain a chapter on the Marine family.]
- Waterston, Elizabeth. *Churches in Delaware During the Revolution, With a Brief Account of Their Settlement and Growth*. Wilmington, 1925.
- Weeks, Stephen B. *Southern Quakers and Slavery: A Study in Institutional History*. Baltimore, 1896.
- Wright, Ernest Neall. *Peter Wright and Mary Anderson: A Family Record*. Ann Arbor, 1939.

B. Articles and Essays

- Cadbury, Henry J. "Negro Membership in the Society of Friends," *Journal of Negro History*. XXI (1936), 151-213.
- Carroll, Kenneth L. "Additional Nicholite Records," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. LII (1957), 74-80.
- . "Joseph Nichols and the Nicholites of Caroline County, Maryland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. XLV (1950), 47-61.
- . "Joseph Nichols, of Delaware: an Eighteenth Century Religious Leader," *Delaware History*. VII (1956), 37-48.
- . "Maryland Quakers and Slavery," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. XLV (1950), 215-225.
- . "More about the Nicholites," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. XLVI (1951), 278-289.
- . "Maryland Quakers in the Seventeenth Century," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. XLVII (1952), 297-313.
- . "Religious Influences on the Manumission of Slaves in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. XLVI (1961), 176-197.
- . "Quakerism in Caroline County, Maryland: Its Rise and Decline," *The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*. XLVIII (1959), 83-102.
- . "Talbot County Quakerism in the Colonial Period," *Maryland Historical Magazine*. LIII (1958), 326-370.
- . "The Influence of John Woolman on Joseph Nichols and the Nicholites," in Anna Brinton (ed.), *Then and Now: Quaker Essays* (Philadelphia, 1960), pp. 168-179.
- . "The Nicholites Become Quakers: An Example of Unity in Disunion," *The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*. XLVII (1958), 3-19.
- . "The Nicholites of North Carolina," *The North Carolina Historical Review*. XXXI (1954), 453-462.
- Cranor, Henry Downes. "The Taking Over of the Nicholites by the Friends," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. XXVII (1903), 76-79.

INDEX

- ADAMS,
Daniel 26, 72
Eleanor 80
Elijah 84
Esther 72
Nancy 80
Sarah 72, 80
Thomas 28, 84
- ALCOCK,
John 84
- American Revolution 29, 36
- ANDERSON,
Ann 21, 22, 25, 34, 72, 84, 100
Celia 62, 81, 84, 92
Daniel 72, 100
Eli 93, 100
Elic 72
Elijah 72, 100
Elisabeth 99
Ezekiel 84, 100
Isaac 72, 100
James 21, 22, 25, 32, 34, 52, 58,
62, 72, 84, 92, 99, 100
James, Jr. 100
John 100
Lydia 94
Major 52, 72, 84, 100
Mary 72, 94
William 25
Wright 94
- ANDREW,
Celia 84
Elisha 84
Richard 84
William 99
- ANTHONY,
Ann 84, 93
Joseph 84, 93
- ASBURY,
Francis 22, 35, 42, 43, 44, 60
- BACHELOR,
Esther 84
Nathan 84
Nealy 84
William 80
- BARTLETT,
Celia 62, 92
Daniel 84
Elijah 92
Esther 62, 92
James 84
Peggy 80
Rebeccah 57
Solomon 80, 84
- BARTON,
Andrew 72, 93
Ann 72, 94
Anna 72, 93
Anne 62
Edward 62, 66, 72, 98, 99
Elizabeth 72, 93
James 72, 80, 93
Jane 72
John 62, 72, 84, 92
Levin 72, 93
Lydia 72, 93
Mary Ann 62, 72, 92
Peter 72, 93
Rhoda 72, 93
Sarah 72, 94
Thomas 72
William 72, 84, 93
- BATCHELDER,
Eleanor 72
John 72, 84
John Jr. 72
Liddy 72
Naomi 72
William 72, 84
William Jr. 72
- BATCHELOR,
John 80
William 34
- Bayside Meeting 56
- BEACHAMP,
Andrew 84, 98, 99
Charles 51
Curtis 51, 84
Elizabeth 52
Ellick 51
Henry 51
John 51
Levi 51
Matthew 51
Milcha 52
Russ 51
Sophia 84
William 51
William Jr. 51
- BECK,
Edward 80, 84
- BERRY,
Adah 72, 80, 84
Delilah 72, 80, 84
John 92
Littleton 72, 84
Mary 56, 57, 94
Naomi 72, 84, 94

INDEX

- Thomas 68
William 34, 72, 84, 94
- BICHAM,
 Mary 80
- BISHOP,
 Aaron 72
 Ariminta 72
 Elenor 72
 Frances 72
 James 72
 John 72
 Levin 72
 Lydia 72
 Mary 72
 Nathan 72
 Rachel 72
 Robert 34, 72, 84
 Sarah 72
 William 72
 William, Jr. 72
- BLADES,
 Elizabeth 98
- BOON,
 James 62, 84, 92
 Mary 62, 84, 98
 Sarah 92
- BRANGHON,
 Sophia 28, 84
- BREEDING,
 John 84
 Mary 80
- BRIGHT,
 Solomon 84
- BUCHINHAM,
 Levi 84
- CAIN (CANE),
 Thomas, Sr. 80, 84
 Unisey 100
- CALDWELL,
 Alexander 47
 David 47
 James 47, 49
- CALLAWAY,
 Joseph 84
- CALLAY,
 Ann 100
- Cambridge (Md.) 28
- CANNON,
 Tubman 84
- Capital Punishment 30
- CARNER,
 Aaron 72
 Joshua 72
 Marget 72
- Caroline County (Md.) 19, 21, 25, 28,
 29, 33, 34, 38, 56, 57, 64,
 65, 80, 81
- CARROLL,
 John 84
- CARTER,
 Mary 80
- CAUSEY,
 Ann 81
 Robert 85
- Centre Meeting 38, 64, 65, 66
Centre Monthly Meeting 62, 63
- CHADWICK,
 Elizabeth 14
 Joseph 14
- CHANCE,
 Aaron 85
 Amilla 94
 Bachelor 85
 Eliza 85
 Esther 61, 85, 92
 Henney 81
 Rich 85
 Tilghman 85
- CHARLES,
 Ann 72
 Caleb 72
 Daniel 72
 Elijah 62, 72, 85, 92
 Elisha 47
 Esther 94
 Euphama 62, 72, 81, 85, 92
 Henry 73, 81, 85, 92
 Isaac 27, 72, 80, 85
 Isaac, Jr. 73
 Isaac (of Wm.) 73
 Jacob 72, 85, 93
 Jacob, Jr. 73, 85
 Jacob (of Wm.) 73
 Jacob (of Isaac) 73, 85
 John 73
 Leah 73
 Levi 47
 Levin 32, 47, 49, 73, 85
 Lovey 73
 Mary 47, 62, 85, 92
 Michael 47
 Nuton 73
 Ruben 73
 Saphier 72
 Sarah 62, 73, 81, 85, 92
 Solomon 27, 57, 73, 80, 85
 William 47, 49, 73, 80, 85
 William (of Isaac) 73

INDEX

- Willis 62, 73, 80, 85, 92, 99
- Wright 94
- CHILCUTT,**
 - Anne (Anna) 73, 98
 - Celia 73, 81, 85, 98
 - Chloe 73, 80
 - Esther 62, 73, 85, 93, 98
 - John 73, 98
 - Joshua 34, 57, 73, 85, 98
 - Mary 73, 98
 - Peter 73, 98
 - Phebe 73, 85, 98
 - Rhoda 73, 85, 98
- CHIPMAN,**
 - Benjamin 32, 58, 85, 100
 - Benjamin Jr. 100
 - Margaret 21, 22, 25
 - Mary 100
 - Paris 21, 22, 25, 46, 49, 85, 100
 - Stephen 100
 - Susana 100
- Choptank Meeting 56
- Church of England 13, 28, 29, 35
- CLAMPETT,** see CLAMPITT
- CLAMPITT,**
 - Henry 85
 - Samuel 100
- CLARK,**
 - James 85
- CLAYPOOL,**
 - James 85
- COLDSCOTT,**
 - Sarah 99
- COLLINS,**
 - Nicey 85
 - Sarah 85
- Concord (Md.) 38
- CONNALLEY,**
 - Jeremiah 85
- Connecticut 13
- CONNELLY,**
 - Margaret 62, 92
- COOK,**
 - Thomas 85
- COOPER,**
 - Mary 81
 - Risdon 85
- CORSE,**
 - Cassandra 68
- COVEY,**
 - Ann 73
 - Mary 85
 - Noble 34, 73, 80, 85
 - Rachel 73
- Rebecca 73
- Rhoda 85
- Sarah 73
- COWGILL,**
 - Clayton 68
 - Daniel 68
 - John 37
 - Mary 68
 - Sarah 68
- CRAIN,**
 - Patrick 100
- CRAINER,** see CRANOR
- CRANER,** see CRANOR
- CRANOR,**
 - Esther 80
 - Joshua 85, 92, 98
 - Solomon 85
- CROMEAN,**
 - Andrew 73
 - Beachamp 73
 - Blades 73
 - Dorcas 73
 - Elijah 66, 73, 85, 94
 - Elijah Jr. 73
 - James 73
 - Joseph 73
 - Levin 73
 - Lovey 73
 - Rhoda 73
 - Sarah 73
 - Thomas 73
 - Tristram 73
- DASHIELL,**
 - Eleanor Marine 46
- DAVIS,**
 - Aquila 85
 - Solomon 85
- DAWSON,**
 - Anne 62, 85, 99
 - Daniel 73, 85, 93
 - Deborah 73, 93
 - Edward 85
 - Elijah 99
 - Elisha 62, 66, 73, 80, 85, 92, 99
 - Elizabeth 85, 99
 - Isabel 85, 99
 - John 62, 80, 85, 92, 99
 - Jonas 85, 99
 - Joseph 99
 - Lydia 61, 73, 85, 92, 94, 99
 - Margaret 85, 99
 - Phebey 85
 - Shadrach 99

INDEX

- William 25, 26, 28, 34, 36, 57, 66,
 86, 93, 99
William Jr. 99
William Frederick 99
William (of Elisha) 73
DEANE,
 Joshua 86
Deep River (N. C.) 46, 47, 50, 51, 52
Deep River Monthly Meeting 51
Delaware 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 25, 30,
 37, 44, 46, 47, 54, 57
Denton (Md.) 38, 66
DIAL,
 Ann 99
DICKINSON,
 John 57
DOBSON,
 William 86
Dorchester County (Md.) 21, 25, 27,
 28, 33, 80, 81
Dover (Delaware) 13, 103
Duck Creek 37
Dunkards 50
DUNNING,
 Thomas 24, 32
Eastern Shore of Maryland 16, 18,
 19, 29, 46, 50, 56
ECCLES,
 Ann 34, 58, 73, 100
 Anna 73, 100
 Anthony 73, 100
 Elic 73
 Esther 73, 100
 Hannah 100
 Jesse 100
 John 73, 100
 Julana 73, 100
 Lvdia 73, 100
 Mary 73, 100
 Richard 34, 58, 73, 86, 100
 Richard Jr. 58, 73, 100
 Sarah 73, 86, 100
ECHOLS, see ECCLES
Edisto Community (S. C.) 13
EDMONDSON,
 John Jr. 28, 86
 Mary 28, 86
Education 31
EDWARDS,
 Jonathan 14
EMMERSON,
 Anne 62, 92
 Elizabeth 81
 Jonathan 100
Margaret 94
Samuel 62, 86
Samuel Jr. 86
Europe 66
EVANS,
 Joshua 22, 40, 41, 52, 56
EVITTS,
 Ann 73
 Naomi 73
 Sarah 73
 Seth Hill 62, 63, 66, 73, 86, 94,
 98, 99
Federalsburg (Md.) 38, 65
FERRIS,
 Benjamin 41
FIDMON,
 Elizabeth 81
FIDMUN,
 Hawkins 86
FISHER,
 Alexander 74, 93
 Allifare 74
 Daniel 62, 74, 92
 Frances 74
 George 74, 93
 George Hardy 62, 74, 92
 John 74
 Levicey 74
 Rachel 74, 93
 Robert 74
 Sarah 74, 93
FLEHARTY,
 Stephen 98
FLOWER,
 John 28, 86
FOSTER,
 Anna 74
 Elizabeth 74
 Joseph 74, 86
 Mary 74
 Peter 74
 Rebecca 86
 Thomas 74, 86
FOXWELL,
 Adams 94
 Ann 94
 Daniel 94
 George 94
 Richard 62, 86, 92
FRAMPTON, see FRAMPTON
FRAMPTON,
 Ann 74
 Catharine 81
 Elizabeth 62, 92

INDEX

- Hubird (Hubert) 74, 80, 86, 98
Isaac 74, 93
John 86
Levin 74
Levi 86
Margaret 62, 74, 92
Richard 86
Sarah 86
Thomas 74, 86
William 62, 74, 80, 86, 92
FRENEY,
 Mr. 43
French and Indian War 30
GARRETTSON,
 Freeborn 22, 42, 43, 44, 60
General Assembly (Md.) 37
General Assembly (N. C.) 48, 50, 54
Georgia 57
GLANDING,
 Rachel 100
 Thomas 100
 William 100
GODWIN,
 Henry 62, 86
 Preston 62
 Seth 62
 Tabitha 62
GOFORTH,
 George 100
 Peter 100
 Sarah 25, 58, 100
 Thomas 100
 Zachariah 25, 58, 86, 100
GOSLIN,
 Daniel 74
 Esther 74
 Ezekiel 74, 80, 86
 Marget 74, 80, 86
 Waitman 86
GRAY,
 Anna 62, 74
 Ann(e) 92
 Elizabeth 62, 74, 92, 93, 94
 Esther 74, 92
 Jacob 74
 Joseph 74, 92
 Lovey 62, 74, 92
 Lydia 74, 93
 Matthew 86
 Perry 74, 92
 Sarah 62, 74, 92, 93
 Thomas 62, 92
 William 62, 66, 74, 92, 93, 98
 William Jr. 74
Great Awakening 14
Greensboro Meeting 56
GRELLET,
 Stephen 52, 56
GREY,
 Levin 86
 Thomas 80, 86
Guilford County (N. C.) 46, 47, 50,
 51
Gum Swamp (S. C.) 51, 52
HALL,
 Robert 98
HARRIS,
 Ann 74, 80, 86, 98, 99
 Anne 80
 Celia 86
 Elizabeth 74, 98
 Esther 74, 80, 86, 99
 Isaac 74, 98
 James 34, 35, 43, 58, 59, 61, 62,
 67, 74, 86, 92, 98, 99
 James (of Wm.) 74, 80, 86, 98
 Jane 98
 Jeane 74
 John 74, 98
 Levin 74, 98
 Lydia 74, 80, 86, 98, 99
 Mary 34, 62, 74, 86, 92, 98, 99
 Nathan 93
 Peter 62, 74, 86, 92, 99
 Rachel 74, 86, 98
 Rhoda 74, 80, 86, 99
 Sarah 74, 80, 86, 99
 William 25, 26, 34, 57, 74, 86,
 93, 94
 William Jr. 74, 94
HARVEY,
 Beacham 99
 Catharine 62, 81, 92, 99
 Celia 74
 John 57, 74, 81, 98, 99
 John Jr. 74
 Mary 74, 86
 Rhoda 74
 Samuel 74, 86, 99
 Sophia 74, 99
Haw River (N. C.) 47
HERONS,
 John 68
HICKS
 Elias 22, 56, 64
HILFORD,
 David 24, 32, 58, 86, 100
 Sarah 24, 86, 100

INDEX

- HOBBS,
 Comfort 99
 Solomon 99
- HOLBROOK,
 Alexander 74, 86
 Alice 74
 Daniel 74
 Frederick 75
 Sarah 74
 William 75
- HOLLAND (HOLLON),
 Laban 86
- HOLLIDAY,
 Robert 68
- HOPKINS,
 Lambert 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21,
 22, 32
- HORNEY,
 James 26, 34, 47, 57, 86, 99
 Jeffry 99
 John 47, 49, 87, 99
 Philip 87, 99
 William 47, 49, 87, 99
- HOWELL,
 Samuel 68
- HUBBARD,
 Ann 99
 Edward 75, 81, 87, 94
 Jesse 62, 75, 92, 94, 98
 John 94
 Margaret 75, 87
 Nicee 75
 Peter 75, 87
 Priscilla 62, 75
 Sarah 75
 Tilghman 75
 William 47
- HUBBERT, see HUBBARD
- HUNN,
 Susanna 68
- Indiana 66
- INGLES,
 Parson 103
- JENKINS,
 Ann 75, 98
 James 87
 Henry 87
 Hessey 87
 Mary 75, 87, 100
 Mary Ann 80
 Peter 75
 Richard 75, 80, 87
 Richard Jr. 75
 Sarah 62, 75, 80, 81, 87
- Thomas 87
- JESTER,
 Ebenezer 75
 Frances 100
 Jehu 75
 John 75
 Joshua 75
 Lydia 75
 Mary 100
 Nathan 75
 Phyllis 100
 Sarah 75, 100
- JOHNSON,
 Cornelius 87
 Lemon 87
- JONES,
 Charles 99
 Elizabeth 80
 Hannah 99
 John 87
 William 99
- JORDAN,
 Richard 56
- KELLEY,
 Ann 75, 80, 98
 Anna 93
 Dennis 62, 66, 75, 80, 81, 87, 92,
 98
 Elender 95
 Elizabeth 75, 87, 98
 Hannah 62, 92
 Hicks 75, 87, 93, 98
 John 75, 98
 Jonah 95
 Leah 98
 Mary 75, 93, 95, 98
 Martin 75, 98
 Perry 94
 Peter 75, 98
 William 57, 75, 87, 93, 98
- William Jr. 75, 98
 William (of Dennis) 75
- Kent County (Delaware) 13, 14, 21,
 25, 32, 44, 46, 52, 58,
 64, 80
- Kent County (Md.) 64, 80
- KENTON,
 Elizabeth 92
 Solomon 62, 87, 92, 99
 Solomon Jr. 92
- KIMMEY,
 Abraham 100
 James 87

INDEX

- LEVERTON,**
 Ann, 75
 Charles 75, 93
 Daniel 75, 87, 98
 Elizabeth 75, 93
 Isaac 75, 87
 Jacob 75, 93
 Jesse 75, 93
 John 75, 93
 Lemuel 75
 Mary 93
 Moses 28, 62, 75, 80, 87, 92, 98
 Rachel 62, 75, 87, 92, 99
 Rebecca 93
 Rhoda 75
 Samuel 93
 Sarah 75, 93
- LINAGER,**
 Elizabeth 75
 Isaac 26, 27, 47, 52, 75, 80, 87
 James 75
 Mary 75
 Rosanna 26, 52, 75, 80
- Little Pee Dee (S. C.) 51, 52
- LOVE,**
 Ann(e) 62, 87, 92
- LOWE,**
 Lucretia 81
- MACKIMMY,**
 Elijah 87
- MAN,**
 Elizabeth 75, 94
 Joseph 75, 87, 93
 William 75
- MANLOVE,**
 William 24
- MARINE,**
 Charles 51
 Harriet P. 46
 Jesse 51
 John 51
 Jonathan 46, 51
 Jonathan Jr. 51
 Mary 51, 87
 Sarah 80, 87
 Zorobabel 87
- MARINE FAMILY** 46
 Marshy Creek Meeting 19, 21, 56, 57, 63
- MARTIN,**
 Isaac 22, 56, 59
- MARTINO,**
 John 87
- MASLIN,**
 James 68
- MASON,**
 Abraham 75, 87
 Lydia 75
 Mary 75
 Naomi 75
 Reubin 75
 Rhoda 75
 Sarah 75
- Matrimony Creek (N. C.) 47
 Matthewstown (Md.) 19
- MCKIMMEY,**
 Esther 87
 John 87
- MELONA, see MELONEY**
- MELONEY,**
 Ann 93
 Clement 92
 Comfort 92
 Eleanor 92
 Elizabeth 92
 James 93
 John 93
 Mary 93
 Priscilla 93
 Sophia 62, 92
 Tilghman 93
 William 62, 92
 William Jr. 92
- MELVIN,**
 Edmond 87
 John 87
 Marget 80
 Mary 87
- Mennonites (Mennonites) 50
 Methodists 13, 14, 22, 42, 43, 60
- MICHERNER,**
 Ezra 60
- MIFFLIN,**
 Anne 68
 Sarah 68
 Warner 68
- MINER,**
 Edward 87
 Misplillion Hundred (Delaware) 14, 27, 44
- Moravians 50
- MORGAN,**
 William 87
- MORRISTON,**
 Cathren 87
 Comfort 75
 Elizabeth 75

INDEX

- George 75
John 75, 81, 87
John Jr. 75, 98
Mary 75
Robinson 76
Sarah 76
Temperance 76
Motherkill Meeting 19
MOWBRAY,
 William 99
MURPHA, see MURPHY
MURPHEY, see MURPHY
MURPHY,
 Ann 87
 Charles 100
 Deborah 81, 87
 Elizabeth 81
 James, 62, 87, 92, 98
 Jonathan 100
 Mary 62, 92, 100
 Ruth 62, 92
 Sarah 100
 William 62, 92
 William Banning 87
 Zachariah 100
Muskmelon (Delaware) 44
NAULER (NAULA),
 Joseph 87
NEEDLES,
 Tristram 56
 William 29
New England 15, 66
New Garden Quarterly Meeting 52
New Jersey 13, 18
Nicholites:
 Petition 48-49
 Queries 26, 40-42
 Rules of Discipline 26, 38-40, 60
NICHOLS,
 Isaac 14, 32, 76, 87
 Joseph 13-32, 76, 87, 100 and
 passim
 Mary 14, 32, 76, 100
 Rachel 14, 76
 Rhoda 14, 76
NOBLE,
 Alexander 76
 Amelia 76
 Archabald 76
 Charles 76
 Daniel 76
 Elizabeth 76
 Esther 76
 James 76
 John 76
Joshua 76, 81, 87
Lovy 76
Mark 87
Rhoda 87
Sarah 76
Solomon 76
Tansey 87
Twyfords 76
William 76
North Carolina 13, 30, 40, 41, 44,
 46-53, 54, 57, 67
North Carolina Yearly Meeting 52,
 56
Northwest Fork Meeting 38, 64, 65,
 66
Northwest Fork Monthly Meeting
 64, 65, 66
Oaths 29, 36, 37
OFFLEY,
 Jane 68
Ohio 66
OLIVER,
 Ruben 14
PAYNE,
 David 28, 88
 Nancy 27, 80
PEGG,
 Martin 28, 47, 88
 Valentine 47, 49, 88
Pennsylvania 16
PERRY,
 Mary 88, 93
PETERS,
 William 62, 88, 92, 99
Philadelphia 16, 20
Piney Grove Monthly Meeting 52
Plainness 30, 31, 54
POITS,
 Adah 62, 92
 Henrietta 76
 Isaac 76, 94
 Sarah 62, 76, 92, 94
 William 62, 76, 80, 88, 92, 94, 99
 William, Jr. 76
POOL,
 Ann 92
 Anna 76
 Daniel 93
 Elizabeth 62, 92
 Isaac 76, 88, 94
 John 76, 81, 88, 92, 93, 99
 John, Jr. 76
 Levin 62, 76, 81, 88, 92
 Noddy 76

INDEX

- Rhoda 94
Sarah 76, 88, 92
William 76, 93
Preston (Md.) 19, 63
PRITCHETT,
 John 62, 81, 88, 94
 Sarah 88, 94
 Wingate 88
 Zachariah 100
PRUITT (PRUETS),
 Southy 88, 94
Quakers 13-65
Queen Anne's Meeting 56
RASIN,
 Ann 68
RAULY,
 Sophia 80
REDIN,
 Charles 100
 William 100
Reed Fork 47
REGESTER,
 John 56
RICHARDSON,
 Elizabeth 76
 James 76
 John 34, 76
 John, Jr. 76, 88
 Joseph 76
 Mary 63, 76, 88, 92
 Peter 76
 Samuel 88
 Sarah 76
 Solomon 76
 Thomas 76
 William 76, 100
RICHETS, see RICKETTS
RICKETTS,
 Nancy 100
 Siny 80
 Thomas 100
RILEY,
 James Whitcomb 46
ROBINSON,
 Samuel 32, 88
ROE,
 Marv 88
Rogerenes 13
ROSS,
 Archibald 63, 88, 93
 Elizabeth 63, 93
 John 88
 Mary 94
 Noah 94
 William 94
ROUTH,
 Martha 56, 59
ROWLAND,
 Isaiah 68
 Ruth 68
RUMBLEY,
 Elisabeth 88
 Mary 80
RUSSELL,
 Ariminta 76
 Elijah 63, 76, 80, 88, 92
 Esther 63, 76, 88, 92
 Nathan 76
 Rachel 76
SAFFARD,
 Rachel 80
SAULSBURY,
 Charles 98
 Daniel 98
 Deborah 98
 Lydia 99
 Nehemiah 57, 98
 Noah 98
 Wilson 98
SCOTT,
 Job 22, 48, 52, 54
SHANNAHAN,
 Deborah 88, 94
 Elizabeth 94
 Jonathan 63, 92
 Margaret 63, 92
SHARP,
 Isaac 88
SHERIDINE,
 Elizabeth 100
SHIELD,
 Reuben
SIPPLE,
 Uriah 100
Slavery 18-22, 25-27, 55
SLEEPER,
 John 21, 22, 25
SMITH,
 Ann 76
 Caleb 76
 Daniel 76
 Frances 80
 James 99
 Joshua 76, 88, 93
 Joshua, Jr. 76
 Levin 88
 Mary 88
 Matthew 88
Southern Quarterly Meeting 63, 65, 68

INDEX

- South Carolina 13, 51, 52, 54, 57, 67
 STACK,
 Rachel 88
 Thomas 88
 STAFFORD,
 James 88
 Jarvis 53, 88
 STANDLEY,
 Deborah 99
 Joseph 28, 46, 49, 88
 STANFORD,
 Richard 28, 88
 STANTON,
 Anna 76, 94
 Beauchamp 66, 76, 80, 81, 88,
 94, 98
 Chloe 76
 Deborah 76, 88
 Elizabeth 94, 98
 Esther 81, 88
 James 76, 94, 98
 John 88, 98
 Lydia 76
 Mary 76, 94, 98
 Peter 76, 94
 Sarah 76, 88, 94
 Thomas 34, 57, 76, 80, 88, 94, 98
 STEVENS,
 Ann 76
 Azel 76
 Daniel 76, 98
 James 77, 88
 Jonathan 77, 98
 Mary 63, 76, 77, 98
 Rachael 77
 Rebekah 76
 Robinson 77, 88
 Rhoda 77, 98
 Sarah 77, 98
 William 57, 77, 88, 98
 STUARD,
 Charles 88
 SULAVANE, see SULLIVANE
 SULIVANE, see SULLIVANE
 SULLIVANE,
 Daniel 77, 80
 Daniel, Jr. 77
 David 28, 88
 Florence 28, 88
 Isaac 77
 John 77, 88
 Joseph 77
 Levin 88
 Margaret 77
 Mary 77, 88
 Owen 77, 81, 88, 99
 Sarah 77, 88
 Sussex County (Del.) 33, 35, 44, 64,
 80, 81
 SWIGGETT,
 Adah 77, 93
 Daniel 99
 Esther 77, 93
 Harmon 99
 Henry 57, 77, 93, 99
 Henry, Jr. 99
 James 99
 John 77, 93
 Johnson 63, 77, 80, 88, 92, 99
 Levin 77, 99
 Mary 63, 77, 88, 92
 Mynta 77, 93
 Rhoda 77, 89, 99
 Sarah 63, 77, 92, 93, 99
 Solomon 77, 93
 William 88, 99
 SWIGGINS,
 Lydia 89
 Talbot County (Md.) 19, 21, 56, 64,
 80
 TAYLOR,
 Anna 100
 Esther 100
 Third Haven Meeting 56
 Third Haven Monthly Meeting 56,
 57, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65
 TILOR, see TYLOR
 TODD,
 Benjamin 89
 TOWNSEND,
 Benjamin 77
 Celia 77
 Elizabeth 77
 Henry 77
 Sarah 77
 Thomas 77
 Tuckahoe Meeting 19, 56
 Tuckahoe Neck Meeting 38, 65
 TULL,
 Esther 28, 89
 Richard 26, 89
 TUMBLESTON,
 Ebenezar 77
 Henry 77
 Jane 77
 Mary 77
 TUMBLIN,
 Covil 32, 89, 100

INDEX

- Mary 13
Nathaniel 13
- TWIFORD,**
Archibald L. 89
Elizabeth 63, 66, 89, 92, 94
Jonathan 66, 81, 89, 94
Sarah 81
Solomon 89
Thomas 47
Zorobabe Smith 89
- TYLOR,**
Thomas 94
Wilson 66, 68
- VICKERS, see VICKERS**
- VICKARS, see VICKERS**
- VICKERS,**
Celia 63, 89, 92, 98
John 77 89, 93, 94
John Jr. 77
Joseph 77, 89
Joshua 93
Mary 77, 80
Nathan 77
Pheba 94
Richard 63, 77, 81, 89, 92
Sarah 63, 92
William 93
- VICTOR,**
Mary 80
- Virginia 57
Virginia Yearly Meeting 56
- WADDEL, Mary** 99
- WALKER, Ariminta** 77
James 77
John 77, 89
John Jr. 77
- WALLIS,**
Aney 81
- War 30, 36
- WARD,**
Ann(e) 77, 80, 99
Daniel 57, 77, 89, 99
Esther 77
Henry 57, 77, 81, 89, 98, 99
Henry Jr. 77, 99
James 77, 89, 94, 99
Lucretia 94
Lydia 99
Mary 77, 89, 99
Rachel 77, 99
Richard 77, 99
Sarah 77
- WARREN,**
Amos 77
- Baley 77
Elizabeth 77
John 77
Johnson 77
Lidy 77
Lily 77
Marget 77
Mary 78
Prisilla 77
Rhoda 78
William 34, 77, 89, 98
William Jr. 78
- WATKINS,**
Thomas 89
- WEBB,**
James 89
- WESLEY,**
John 14
West Indies 57
Western Shore of Maryland 16, 56
- WHEATLEY,**
Anthony 29, 41, 63, 78, 92, 93
Anthony Jr. 78
Arthur 93
Byng (Bing) 78, 92
Daniel 78, 93
Elizabeth 78, 92
Euphama 78, 92
Isaac 78, 93
Sophia 63, 78, 92
Talitha 78
William 78, 92
- WHEELER,**
William 47, 50
Winlock 14
- WHITE,**
Joshua 89
- WHITEFIELD,**
George 14
- WHITELY,**
Anthony 41
Alexander 100
- WIGHAM,**
John 52, 56
- WILLIAMS,**
Adah 94
Bartholomew 78
Celia 94
Delilah 89, 94
Eleanor 89
John 78
John Jr. 78
Joshua 94
Lavisa 78

INDEX

- Mary 94
Morgan 44
Newell 78
Rachel 78
Sarah 78, 94
Thomas 98
William 80, 89, 94
- WILLIS,**
Andrew 78, 89
Andrew, Jr. 78
Anne 78, 89
Elic 78, 98
Jesse 78, 89, 98
Joshua 78, 98
Mary 78, 89
Milby 78, 98
Milley 78, 89, 98
Rhoda 78
Roger 78
Sarah 78
Shadrich 78, 98
Sina(i) 78, 89, 98
Thomas 57, 78, 80, 98
Thomas Jr. 78, 89, 98
William 78, 81, 89
- WILLOUGHBY,**
Prudence 98
- WILLSON, see WILSON**
- WILSON,**
Ann(e) 63, 78, 89, 92
Arimanti 80
Catharine 89
Daniel 99
Elisha 65, 99
Elizabeth 89, 94
George 99
Hannah 78, 81, 89
Jacob 93
James 63, 66, 78, 81, 89, 92, 99
James Jr. 92, 99
John 63, 78, 89, 92, 99
Jonathan 57, 99
Jonathan Jr. 99
Joshua 99
Levina 99
Lydia 98, 99
Mary 78, 89, 94, 99
Nathan 93
Peter 99
Rachel 78, 89, 92, 99
Rebeccah 63, 89, 92, 94, 99
Sarah 63, 89, 92
Solomon 57, 80, 89, 99
Solomon Jr. 99
- Tabitha 100
William 63, 78, 89, 92, 99
William Jr. 78, 92
Wolf's Island Creek 47
- WOOLMAN,**
John 16, 18-23, 25, 26, 30, 38, 55, 56
- WORRILAW,**
John 89
- WRIGHT,**
Aaron 93
Ann 78, 81, 89, 93, 94, 98, 99
Anna 89
Celia 80, 89, 93
Charles 78, 98
Daniel 63, 80, 89, 92, 94, 98, 99
Edward 89
Elisha 89, 93
Elizabeth 63, 78, 92, 99
Esther 63, 78, 89, 92, 99
Euphama 90
Harris 93
Hatfield 63, 66, 78, 81, 90, 92, 98
Jacob 63, 78, 80, 90, 92, 99
James 63, 78, 80, 90, 92, 93, 94, 98
John 28, 63, 78, 80, 90, 92, 94, 99
Lemuel 57, 78, 90, 98, 99
Levin 28, 57, 78, 80, 90, 98, 99
Levin Jr. 90, 98
Levina 90
Levisa 93
Lovey 90
Lucrecia 63, 92
Lydia 93
Mary 63, 78, 81, 90, 92, 93, 98, 99
Millah 93
Nathan 93
Peter 78, 90, 93, 98
Rachel 78, 80, 99
Rhoda 63, 90, 92, 93, 99
Roger 57, 78, 90, 93, 98, 99
Samuel 93
Sarah 63, 78, 80, 90, 92, 93, 99
Selah 78
Tilghman 93
William 28, 78, 90, 93
William James 94
Willis 78, 93
- YARNELL,**
Martha 56

Date Due

Demco 293-5

DO2633229R



Duke University Libraries